

Pseudo-holomorphic curves and envelopes of meromorphy of two-spheres in $\mathbb{CP}^2$.

S. Ivashkovich*, V. Shevchishin**

January 1995.

Table of contents.

0. Introduction.	pp.2–7.
0.1. Envelopes of meromorphy.	
0.2. Sketch of the proof.	
0.3. Smoothness of the moduli space in a neighbourhood of a cusp-curve.	
0.4. The Genus formula.	
1. Deformations.	pp.7–9.
1.1. Deformation of structure.	
1.2. The Genus formula for immersed symplectic surfaces.	
2. The $D_{u,J}$ -operator and its properties.	pp.10–22.
2.1. The definition of $D_{u,J}$ -operator.	
2.2. Operator $\bar{\partial}_{u,J}$ and a holomorphic structure on the induced bundle.	
2.3. Surjectivity of $D_{u,J}$.	
2.4. Deformation of cusp-curves.	
3. Singular points of pseudo-holomorphic curves and positivity of geometric self-intersections.	pp.22–32.
3.1. Unique continuation lemma.	
3.2. Inversion of $\bar{\partial}_J + R$.	
3.3. Perturbing cusps of pseudo-holomorphic curves.	
3.4. Positivity of geometric self-intersection.	
4. The Bennequin index and the Genus formula for pseudo-holomorphic curves.	pp.32–39.
4.1. Transversality and the Bennequin index of the cusp.	
4.2. The Genus formula and the lower estimate of the Bennequin index.	
5. Continuity principles and envelopes.	pp.39–47.
5.1. Continuity principles relative to the Kähler spaces.	
5.2. Construction of the family of curves and the proof of the Theorem 1.	
5.3. Examples.	
6. Appendix.	pp.47–52.
6.1. A complex structure lemma.	
6.2. A matching structures lemma.	
6.3. Gromov topology and versal deformations of noncompact curves.	
References.	pp.52–54.

* Supported in part by Schwerpunkt "Komplexe Mannigfaltigkeiten".

** Supported in part by SFB-237.

0. Introduction.

0.1. Envelopes of meromorphy.

Consider a complex surface X , i.e. a two-dimensional complex manifold, which is connected, Hausdorff and countable at infinity. Suppose that X admits a Kähler form ω . Further let $u : S^2 \rightarrow X$ be an immersion of a standard two-dimensional sphere into X . We shall call this immersion ω -positive (or ω -symplectic) if $u^*\omega$ is strictly positive 2-form on S^2 with respect to the standard orientation of S^2 . We suppose moreover, that self-intersections of $M := u(S^2)$ are transversal and positive. We denote by δ the number of pairs $s_1 \neq s_2 \in S^2$ with $u(s_1) = u(s_2)$.

Denote by $c_1(X)$ a 2-form on X representing the first Chern class of X . For a closed immersed two-surface M in X denote by $c_1(X) \cdot [M]$ the value of the first Chern class on $[M]$, i.e. the number $\int_M c_1(X)$. Let U be an open neighbourhood of $u(S^2) = M$. Recall that the envelope of meromorphy of open set U is a maximal domain $(\hat{U}, \pi)$ over X with an inclusion $i : U \rightarrow \hat{U}$ such that every meromorphic function f , which is defined on U , extends to a meromorphic function $\hat{f}$ on $\hat{U}$. Such envelope always exists, see §5. We shall say that the domain $(\hat{U}, \pi)$ over X is unbounded if $\pi(\hat{U})$ is not relatively compact in X .

In this paper we call a Kähler surface (X, ω) positive if for any almost complex structure J on X tamed by ω (see definition below) any J -holomorphic sphere C satisfies $[C]^2 \geq 0$.

Our first result here is the following

Theorem 1. *Let M be a ω -positive immersed two-sphere in a positive Kähler surface (X, ω) , having only positive self-intersections. Suppose that $c_1(X) \cdot [M] - \delta = p \geq 1$. Then the envelope of meromorphy $(\hat{U}, \pi)$ of any neighbourhood U of M is either unbounded or contains a one-dimensional compact analytic set C such that:*

(1) $\pi(C) = \bigcup_{k=1}^N C_k$ is a union of rational curves.

(2) $\sum_{k=1}^N (c_1(X) \cdot [C_k] - \delta_k - \varkappa_k) \geq p$.

Here δ_k and $\varkappa_k$ are nonnegative integers which we define below. δ_k is a number of nodes of C_k taken with appropriate multiplicities, and $\varkappa_k$ is a sum of conductors of the cusps of C_k .

Consider for example the case $X = \mathbb{CP}^2$ with the usual Fubini-Study form ω_{FS} . Then $H_2(\mathbb{CP}^2, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$ and for any surface $M \sim n \cdot \mathbb{CP}^1$ one has $[M]^2 = n^2 \geq 0$. So $\mathbb{CP}^2$ is positive in our sense. Also, as it is well known $c_1(\mathbb{CP}^2) = 3 \cdot \omega_{FS}$. Remark further, that any imbedded two-sphere in $\mathbb{CP}^2$ is homologous to zero, $\pm \mathbb{CP}^1$ or $\pm 2\mathbb{CP}^1$, in the third case it means to the quadric. After reversing the orientation, if necessary, we can rest on the case with $+$. Further, since ω -positivity implies $\int_S \omega > 0$, the condition on the Chern class is now satisfied automatically.

If M is symplectically immersed in $\mathbb{CP}^2$ with positive self-intersections, then the condition $c_1(\mathbb{CP}^2)[M] > \delta$ means that

$$c_1(\mathbb{CP}^2)[M] > \delta = \frac{[M]^2 - c_1(\mathbb{CP}^2) \cdot [M]}{2} + 1, \quad (0.1)$$

(see the Genus formula for symplectic surfaces in *Lemma 1.3.1*). Thus (0.1) can be rewritten as $3m > (m^2 - 3m)/2 + 1$ where $[M] = m[\mathbb{CP}^1]$.

So one has the following

Corollary 1. *The envelope of meromorphy of any immersed symplectic sphere in $\mathbb{CP}^2$ of degree not more than 8 with only positive self-intersections contains a rational curve and thus, in fact coincides with $\mathbb{CP}^2$ itself. In particular, this is true for every symplectically embedded sphere in $\mathbb{CP}^2$.*

Remark. 1. As examples of symplectic surfaces in Kähler surfaces one can consider “ C^1 -small perturbations” of holomorphic curves, because the condition to be symplectic (ω -positive) is obviously open.

2. Another example, which is discussed in §5, shows that the envelope of meromorphy of every imbedded symplectic sphere in $\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$ with natural Kähler structure contains a rational curve, which is a graph of a rational function.

3. In 5.3 the surfaces of higher genus are also discussed. In fact the envelope of meromorphy of any symplectic surface in $\mathbb{CP}^2$ of degree ≤ 8 (i.e. of genus ≤ 21) coincides with $\mathbb{CP}^2$, see *Corollary 5.3.2*.

4. In fact we prove more general statement than that is given in *Theorem 1*. Namely, one can replace meromorphic functions (i.e. meromorphic mappings into $\mathbb{CP}^1$) by meromorphic mappings with values into arbitrary disk-convex Kähler spaces, see 5.2.

5. As a corollary of the *Theorem 1* we obtain a result on rigidity of symplectic imbeddings of two-spheres in $\mathbb{CP}^2$ under biholomorphisms, see *Corollary 5.2.2*.

We want to point out the difference of the situation studied here with that of 2-spheres in $\mathbb{C}^2$, see [B-K], [Sh]. Our spheres are *symplectic*, in particular, they are not homologous to zero.

0.2. Sketch of the proof.

We give now a short sketch of the proof of *Theorem 1*.

Step 1: Deformation of a structure. Using ω -positivity of M we construct a smooth curve $\{J_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ of almost complex structures on X satisfying the following properties:

- a) J_0 is the given integrable structure on X .
- b) $\{x \in X : J_t(x) \neq J_0(x)\} \subset U_1 \subset\subset U$ for each $t \in [0,1]$, i.e. each J_t is different from J_0 only inside some relatively compact open subset U_1 (the same for all J_t) of the given neighbourhood U of M .
- c) M is J_1 -holomorphic.
- d) All $\{J_t\}$ are “tamed” by our Kähler form ω , i.e. $\omega(v, J_t v) > 0$ for every nonzero $v \in TX$.

Step 2: Deformation of the sphere M . We construct a “piece-wise continuous” family of (possibly reducible) surfaces M_t such that:

- a) M_t is J_t -holomorphic.
- b) $M_1 = M$.
- c) For all $t \in [0,1]$ M_t is a finite union of J_t -holomorphic spheres $\{M_t^j\}$ with

$$\sum c_1(X)[M_t^j] - \delta_j - \kappa_j \geq p.$$

d) The family is "piece-wise continuous" in the following sense. There is a partition of unit interval $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_r = 1$, natural numbers $N_1 \geq \dots \geq N_r = 1$, and J_t -holomorphic maps $u_t : \bigsqcup_{N_i} S^2 \rightarrow X$ for $t \in (t_{i-1}, t_i]$, such that u_t is continuous in $t \in (t_{i-1}, t_i]$, $M_t := u_t(\bigsqcup_{N_i} S^2)$ converges in the Hausdorff metric when $t \searrow t_i$, and $\mathcal{H}\text{-}\lim_{t \searrow t_{i-1}} M_t$ contains $M_{t_{i-1}}$.

Note that by "tameness" of all J_t and closeness of ω the $\text{area}(M_t) \sim \int_{M_t} \omega$ is bounded uniformly for all t . So by Gromov's compactness theorem a Hausdorff limit of M_t exists and is a union of $J_{t_{i-1}}$ -holomorphic spheres.

Step 3: Kontinuitätssatz. Let $(\hat{U}, \pi)$ be the envelope of $U \supset M$. Note that $\Sigma_t = M_t \setminus U_1$ is a holomorphic curve in X with boundary on ∂U_1 , and $\Sigma_1 = \emptyset$. So by the "continuity principle", see §5 for details, Σ_t and thus M_t could be lifted onto the envelope $\hat{U}$. But M_0 is holomorphic and satisfies (c) from *Step 2*. Thus the proof is complete.

For the construction of a family of curves in the *Step 2* we need two results about pseudo-holomorphic curves.

0.3. Smoothness of the moduli space in a neighbourhood of a cusp-curve.

Let (X, J) be an almost complex manifold of a complex dimension n . An almost complex structure is always supposed to have smoothness of class C^1 . Recall that an (irreducible) pseudo-holomorphic (or more precisely J -holomorphic) curve in X is an image of a (connected) Riemannian surface (S, J_S) in X under a C^1 -mapping $u : S \rightarrow X$, which satisfies the equation

$$du + J \circ du \circ J_S = 0 \quad (0.2)$$

In the case of integrable J it is just a Cauchy-Riemann equation. If J is $C^{k, \alpha}$ -smooth with $k \geq 1$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$, then u is $C^{k+1, \alpha}$ -smooth due to elliptic regularity.

Denote by $[\gamma]$ some homology class in $H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$. Fix a compact Riemannian surface S , i.e. a compact, connected, oriented, smooth manifold of real dimensions 2. Fix p with $2 < p < \infty$ and consider a Banach manifold

$$\mathcal{S} = \{u \in L^{1,p}(S, X) : u(S) \in [\gamma]\}$$

of all $L^{1,p}$ -maps from S to X , representing the class $[\gamma]$, (see §2 for details).

Denote by $\mathcal{J}$ the Banach manifold of C^1 -smooth almost complex structures on X , and by $\mathcal{J}_S$ the Banach manifold of C^1 -smooth almost complex structures on S . Consider also a subset $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}_S \times \mathcal{J}$ consisting of all triples (u, J_S, J) with u being (J_S, J) -holomorphic, i.e.

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(u, J_S, J) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}_S \times \mathcal{J} : du + J \circ du \circ J_S = 0\} \quad (0.3)$$

Denote by $\text{pr}_{\mathcal{J}} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}_S \times \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ the natural projection onto the third factor.

We are interested when $\text{pr}_{\mathcal{J}} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ is a surjective map, or more precisely, when for a given pseudo-holomorphic curve $u : (S, J_S) \rightarrow (X, J)$ one can find a neighbourhood $V \subset \mathcal{J}$ of J and a continuous section of a fibration $\text{pr}_{\mathcal{J}} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ over V , which passes through

$(u, J_S, J) \in \mathcal{P}$. In other words, when for every small perturbation $\tilde{J}$ of J one can find a small perturbation $\tilde{u}$ of u , which is $\tilde{J}$ -holomorphic.

We show that for the pseudo-holomorphic curve $u : (S, J_S) \rightarrow (X, J)$ the pulled-back bundle $E := u^*TX$ possesses the natural *holomorphic* structure, such that the differential $du : TS \rightarrow E$ is a *holomorphic* homomorphism. This allows us to define the order of vanishing of the differential du at a point $s \in S$. We denote this number by $\text{ord}_s du$.

Let $\mathcal{O}(N_0)$ be a free part of the quotient $\mathcal{O}(E)/du(\mathcal{O}(TS))$, i.e.

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(TS) \xrightarrow{du} \mathcal{O}(E) \xrightarrow{\text{pr}} \mathcal{O}(N_0) \oplus \mathcal{N}_1 \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $\mathcal{N}_1$ is supported on the finite set of cusps of u (i.e. points of vanishing of du). On the space $L^{1,p}(S, N_0)$ of sections of the bundle N_0 the natural Gromov operator $D_N : L^{1,p}(S, N_0) \rightarrow L^p(S, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes N_0)$ is defined. We prove the following

Theorem 2. *Suppose that D_N is surjective. Then*

i) *for some neighbourhood $U \subset \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}_S \times \mathcal{J}$ of (u, J_S, J) the set $\mathcal{P} \cap U$ is a Banach submanifold of U ;*

ii) *there exists a C^1 -map f from some neighbourhood V of $J \in \mathcal{J}$ into U with $f(V) \subset \mathcal{P}$ and $\text{pr}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ f = \text{Id}_V$, such that $f(J) = (u, J_S, J)$.*

Remark. When X is a surface and N_0 is a line bundle the sufficient condition for surjectivity of D_N is $c_1(N_0) > 2g - 2$, where g is the genus of S , see [Gro], [Hf-L-Sk] and Corollary 2.3.3. So, if $c_1(E) > \sum_{s \in S} \text{ord}_s du$, one has the surjectivity of projection $\text{pr}_{\mathcal{J}}$.

It is important for us that such a map f still exists if even u has cusps, but the sum of their orders is strictly bounded by the first Chern class of the induced bundle. This result extends the result of [Hf-L-Sk] from the case of immersed curves to the case of pseudoholomorphic curves with cusps.

In fact one has also the next result about Moduli space of nonparametrized pseudo holomorphic curves, see 2.4.

Corollary 2. *Let $u : (S, J_S) \rightarrow (X, J)$ be a nonconstant irreducible pseudo-holomorphic map, such that $H_D^1(S, N_0) = 0$. Than in a neighbourhood of $M := u(S)$ the Moduli space of nonparametrized J -holomorphic curves $\mathcal{M}_{[\gamma], g, J}$ is a manifold with the tangent space $T_M \mathcal{M}_{[\gamma], g, J} = H_D^0(S, N_0) \oplus H^0(S, \mathcal{N}_1)$.*

0.4. The Genus formula.

We want now to state our third result. It concerns with the version of so called genus formula for pseudo-holomorphic curves in almost complex surfaces.

By the geometric self-intersection number of pseudo-holomorphic curve $M = u(S)$ we understand the number of pairs (s_1, s_2) of distinct points of S such that $u(s_1) = u(s_2)$, taken with appropriate multiplicities. We call this points *nodes* of M . We prove that there only a finite number of such pairs and multiplicities of intersections are always positive, see §3. Defined in such way the geometric self-intersection number we denote by δ . This definition in an obvious way extends to the case of reducible curves, i.e. curves M which are a union of a finite number of irreducible ones.

We show that for the J -holomorphic curve $u : S \rightarrow X$ with $J \in C^1$ the order of zero of differential $\text{ord}_a du$ at point $a \in S$ is well defined. The points a with $\text{ord}_a du \geq 1$ are

called *cuspidal points* of M . A compact pseudo-holomorphic curve have only finitely many cuspidal points. We define in §4, using the Bennequin index, the number κ_i for a cuspidal point a_i of a pseudo-holomorphic curve, and show that the number κ_i is bounded from below by $\text{ord}_{a_i} du$, see *Corollary 4.2.2*. Following classical terminology we call the number κ_i the *conductor* of a cuspidal point a_i . In the holomorphic case it is also called the Milnor number of a_i . The sum of κ_i over all cuspidal points is denoted by κ . In the case of reducible curve one should take a sum over all irreducible components.

As usually, we denote by $[M]^2$ the homological self-intersection of a surface in four-dimensional manifold. Having J , we can define a first Chern class $c_1(X, J)$ which, in fact, does not change when J varies continuously. Therefore we shall usually omit the dependence $c_1(X)$ on J . Now we are ready to write down the Genus formula.

Theorem 3. (Genus formula). *Let $M = \bigcup_{i=1}^d M_i$ be a pseudo-holomorphic curve in an almost complex surface (X, J) and g_i the genera of its irreducible components M_i . Suppose that J is of class C^1 and that M_i and M_j are distinct for $i \neq j$. Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^d g_i = \frac{[M]^2 - c_1(X)[M]}{2} + d - \delta - \kappa. \quad (0.4)$$

Remark. 1. In the case of a holomorphic curve in a complex surface (0.4) becomes the usual genus formula, or the adjunction formula, or the Plücker formula, well known in classical algebraic geometry, see for example [Gr-Hr] or [Wa].

2. When the structure J is C^∞ -smooth the following important result is due to McDuff: if M is an irreducible J -holomorphic curve of genus g in almost complex surface (X, J) , then $\frac{1}{2}([M]^2 - c_1(X)[M]) + 1 \geq g$, and the equality take place iff M is smoothly imbedded, see [McD-1].

3. Recently, the result similar to our *Theorem 3* was proved in [Mi-Wh], assuming C^2 -differentiability of J using different methods and another description of the numbers κ_i .

We develop here the methods, which enable us to study the local and global properties of pseudo-holomorphic curves under the assumption of C^1 -differentiability of an almost-complex structure J .

Now we want to sketch the construction of the family of curves, needed for the *Step 2* of the proof of *Theorem 1*. We suppose for the sake of simplicity that M is imbedded. Start with M_1 and use the condition $c_1[M] \geq 1$. This allows us to apply *Theorem 2* and construct our family of curves for t in a neighbourhood of 1 in $[0, 1]$. Now let t fall down to t_{r-1} . The Genus formula goes out in the construction in the following way. Because M_t is an embedded smooth pseudo-holomorphic sphere for $t \in (t_{r-1}, 1]$, the Genus formula tells us that

$$0 = \frac{[M_t]^2 - c_1(X)[M_t]}{2} + 1 \quad (0.5)$$

As we have already explained, M_t have uniformly bounded areas. Thus the Gromov compactness theorem provides that $\mathcal{H}\text{-}\lim_{t \searrow t_{r-1}} M_t = \overline{M}_{t_{r-1}}$ breaks into say d spheres $M_1, \dots, M_d$. This system of spheres is connected as a Hausdorff limit of connected sets, so

it has at least $d - 1$ points of geometric self-intersection. Suppose in this sketch of proof that multiplicities does not occur, *i.e.* all $M_1, \dots, M_d$ are distinct. Now the Genus formula tells us once more that

$$0 = \frac{[\overline{M}_{t_{r-1}}]^2 - c_1(X)[\overline{M}_{t_{r-1}}]}{2} + d - \delta - \varkappa \quad (0.6)$$

But the fractions in (0.5) and (0.6) are equal, because they depend only on homology classes. So we have that $1 = d - \delta - \varkappa$, where δ is at least $d - 1$ as we explained. So $\varkappa = 0$ and $\delta = d - 1$. So all irreducible components M_i of $\overline{M}_{t_{r-1}}$ are smooth imbedded pseudo-holomorphic spheres again. Now since $\sum_{i=1}^d c_1(X)[M_i] = p \geq 1$ we can choose from $\{M_i\}$ a subset $\{M_{i_1}, \dots, M_{i_k}\}$ such that $c_1(X)[M_{i_l}] \geq 1$ for $l = 1, \dots, k$ and $\sum_{l=1}^k c_1(X)[M_{i_l}] \geq p$. Repeating this procedure gives us the construction of the family. At the end we want to point out that the genus formula allows us to prove the closeness of the set of $t \in [0, 1]$ for which such family exists. For its openness one needs *Theorem 2* and thus the surjectivity of the $D_{u,J}^N$ -operator, which is associated with a J -holomorphic sphere u . If M is immersed and multiplicities can occur one should be more careful and employ the positivity condition on the Kähler surface (X, ω) .

The authors would like to express their gratitude to the A.Vitushkin, who asked us the question about the meromorphic envelopes of a "small perturbation" of a line at infinity in $\mathbb{CP}^2$. We also want to give our thanks to J.-C. Sikorav, for the usefull conversations and remarks.

1. Deformations.

In this paragraph we shall describe the *Step 1* of the proof of the *Theorem 1*. Also, we shell make some preparatory steps for the proof of the Genus formula.

1.1. Deformation of structure.

First we recall some elementary facts about orthogonal complex structures in $\mathbb{R}^4$.

In $\mathbb{R}^4$ with coordinates x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2 consider the standard symplectic form $\omega = dx_1 \wedge dy_1 + dx_2 \wedge dy_2$ and the standard complex structure J_{st} defined by the operator

$$J_{\text{st}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\mathbb{J}$ denote the set of all orthogonal complex structures in $\mathbb{R}^4$ giving $\mathbb{R}^4$ the same orientation as J_{st} . This means that for any pair x_1, x_2 of J -independent vectors the basis x_1, Jx_1, x_2, Jx_2 gives the same orientation of $\mathbb{R}^4$ as J_{st} . Note that this orientation does not depend on the particular choice of x_1, x_2 . Orthogonality here means just that J is an orthogonal matrix. The following lemma summarizes the elementary facts, which we need for the sequel.

Lemma 1.1.1. *The elements of $\mathbb{J}$ have the form*

$$J_s = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -s & c_1 & c_2 \\ s & 0 & c_2 & -c_1 \\ -c_1 & -c_2 & 0 & -s \\ -c_2 & c_1 & s & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.1.1)$$

with $c_1^2 + c_2^2 + s^2 = 1$. One also has for $x \in \mathbb{R}^4$

$$\omega(x, J_s x) = s \|x\|^2. \quad (1.1.2)$$

The proof will be omitted. We remark that the set $\mathbb{J}$ is a unit two-dimensional sphere S^2 in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with coordinates c_1, c_2, s . We note also that the number $\omega(x, J_s x)$ does not depend on the choice of a *unit* vector x . One also remarks that the standard structure corresponds to the north pole of S^2 and structures tamed by ω constitute the upper half-sphere.

Let M_1 and M_2 be two smooth oriented surfaces in the unit ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ with zero as a common point. Let v_1, w_1 and v_2, w_2 be oriented bases of $T_0 M_1$ and $T_0 M_2$ respectively. Suppose that M_1 and M_2 intersect transversally at zero, i.e. v_1, w_1, v_2, w_2 is the basis of $\mathbb{R}^4$. We say that their intersection is positively if this basis gives the same orientation of $\mathbb{R}^4$ as standard one.

An immersed surface M in an almost complex manifold (X, J) is called (nonparametrized) J -holomorphic curve if TM is J -invariant.

Lemma 1.1.2. *Let M be a ω -positive compact surface immersed into a Kähler surface (X, ω) with only double positive self-intersections, and let $U_1 \subset\subset U$ be neighbourhoods of M . Then there exists a smooth curve $\{J_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ of almost complex structures on X such that:*

- a) J_0 is the given integrable complex structure on X ;
- b) for each $t \in [0,1]$ the set $\{x \in X : J_t(x) \neq J_0(x)\}$ is contained in U_1 ;
- c) M is J_1 -holomorphic;
- d) all J_t are tamed by the given form ω , i.e. $\omega(v, J_t v) > 0$ for every nonzero $v \in TX$.

Proof. Let N be a normal bundle to M in X and V_1 a neighbourhood of the zero section in N . Shrinking V_1 and U_1 we can assume that U_1 is an image of V_1 under an $\exp$ -map in J_0 -Hermitian metric h associated to ω . More precisely, one should take the Riemannian metric associated to h , i.e. $g = \text{Re}h$. Shrinking V_1 and U_1 once more, if necessary, we can extend the distribution of tangent planes to $M = (\text{zero section of } N)$ to the distribution $\{L_x\}_{x \in V_1}$ of ω -positive planes on V_1 . Here we do not distinguish between ω and its lift onto V_1 by $\exp$. Denote by N_x the subspace in $T_x V_1$ which is g -orthogonal to L_x . We can choose the distribution $\{L_x\}$ in such a way that if $\exp(x) = \exp(y)$ for some $x \neq y$ from V_1 then $d\exp_x(L_x) = d\exp_y(N_y)$ and $d\exp_y(L_y) = d\exp_x(N_x)$. In particular, we suppose that M intersects itself g -orthogonally. For every $x \in U_1$ choose an orthonormal basis $e_1(x), e_2(x)$ of L_x such that $\omega_x(e_1(x), e_2(x)) > 0$, and orthonormal basis $e_3(x), e_4(x)$ of N_x such that the basis $e_1(x), e_2(x), e_3(x), e_4(x)$ gives the same orientation of $T_x V_1$ as ω^2 .

Define an almost complex structure J on U_1 by $Je_1 = e_2, Je_3 = e_4$. J depends smoothly on x , even when $e_j(x)$ are not smooth in x . Further $\omega_x(e_1(x), J_x e_1(x)) > 0$ and

thus from *Lemma 1.1.1* we have that $\omega_x(e_3(x), J_x e_3(x)) > 0$. This means that our J is tamed by ω . Note also that M is J -holomorphic.

Denote by $\mathbb{J}_x$ the sphere of g -orthogonal complex structures on $T_x X$ as in *Lemma 1.1.1*. Let γ_x be the shortest geodesic on $\mathbb{J}_x$ joining $J_0(x)$, the given integrable structure, with J_x . Put $J_t(x) = J_{\gamma_x(t \cdot \|\gamma_x\| \cdot \phi(x))}$. Here $\|\gamma_x\|$ denotes the length of γ_x , ϕ is smooth on X with support in U_1 and identically one in the neighbourhood of M . The curve $\{J_t\}$ satisfies all the conditions of our lemma.

q.e.d.

1.2. The Genus formula for immersed symplectic surfaces.

Let us prove now the Genus formula for *immersed symplectic* surfaces. Let $u : \bigsqcup_{j=1}^d S_j \rightarrow (X, \omega)$ be a reduced compact symplectic surface immersed into a symplectic four-dimensional manifold. Let g_j denote the genus of S_j and $M_j = u(S_j)$. Denote by $[M]^2$ the homological self-intersection number of M . Define a geometrical self-intersection number δ of M in the following way. Perturb M to obtain (also symplectic) surface $\widetilde{M}$ with only transversal double points. Then δ will be the sum of indices of intersection over those double points. Those indices can be equal to 1 or -1 .

Surface X carries an almost complex structure J , which is tamed by ω , i.e. $\omega(\xi, J\xi) > 0$ for any nonzero $\xi \in TX$, see [Wn] or [Gro]. Denote by $c_1(X, J)$ the first Chern class of X with respect to J . Since, in fact, $c_1(X, J)$ doesn't depend on continuous changes of J and since the set of ω -tamed almost complex structures is contractible, see [Gro], we usually omit the dependence of $c_1(X)$ on J .

Lemma 1.2.1. *Let $M = \bigcup_{j=1}^d M_j$ be a compact immersed symplectic surface with transversal self-intersections in four-dimensional symplectic manifold X . Then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^d g_j = \frac{[M]^2 - c_1(X)[M]}{2} + d - \delta. \quad (1.2.1)$$

Proof. Replacing every M_j by its small perturbation, we can suppose that M_j has only transversal double self-intersection points. Let N_j be a normal bundle to M_j and let $\widetilde{M}_j$ denote the zero section of N_j . Let also $\exp_j$ be the exponential map from a neighbourhood V_j of $\widetilde{M}_j \subset N_j$ onto the neighbourhood W_j of M_j . Lift ω and J onto V_j . Since $\widetilde{M}_j$ is embedded to V_j , we can apply the *Lemma 1.1.2* to obtain the ω -tame almost complex structure J_j on V_j in which $\widetilde{M}_j$ is pseudo-holomorphic.

For every j we have now the following exact sequence of complex bundles:

$$0 \longrightarrow TS_j \xrightarrow{du} E_j \xrightarrow{pr} N_j \longrightarrow 0 \quad (1.2.2)$$

Here $E_j = (u^*TX)|_{S_j}$ is endowed with complex structure given by J . Since du is nowhere degenerate complex linear morphism, $N_j := E_j/du(TM_j)$ be a complex line bundle over S_j . From (1.2.2) we get

$$c_1(E_j) = c_1(TS_j) + c_1(N_j). \quad (1.2.3)$$

Observe now that $c_1(E_j) = c_1(X)[M_j]$ and that $c_1(TS) = \sum_{j=1}^d c_1(TS_j) = \sum_{j=1}^d (2 - 2g_j) = 2d - 2 \sum_{j=1}^d g_j$. Further, $c_1(N_j)$ is the algebraic number of zeros of a generic smooth section of N_j . To compare this number with self-intersection of M_j in X , note that if we move M_j generically to obtain M'_j , then the intersection number $\text{int}(M_j, M'_j)$ is equal to the algebraic number of zeros of generic section of N_j plus two times the sum of intersection numbers of M_j in self-intersection points, i.e. $[M_j]^2 = c_1(N_j) + 2\delta_j$. So

$$c_1(X)[M_j] = 2 - 2g_j + [M_j]^2 - 2\delta_j. \quad (1.2.4)$$

Now everything that left is to take the sum over $j = 1, \dots, d$ and to remark that intersection points of M_i with M_j for $i \neq j$ make double contribution to $[M]^2$.

q.e.d.

2. The $D_{u,J}$ -operator and its properties.

In this paragraph we want to introduce, following Gromov, $D_{u,J}$ -operator associated to the J -holomorphic curve $u : S \rightarrow X$ in almost complex manifold (X, J) , where J is supposed to be of class C^1 .

2.1. The definition of $D_{u,J}$ -operator.

Recall that a C^1 map $u : S \rightarrow X$ from a Riemannian surface S with a complex structure J_S is called a parameterized pseudo-holomorphic curve with respect to J_S and J if it satisfies the equation

$$du + J \circ du \circ J_S = 0 \quad (2.1.1)$$

This simply means that $du \circ J_S = J \circ du$, i.e. $du : T_p S \rightarrow T_{u(p)} X$ is complex linear map for every $p \in S$. The equation (2.1.1) is an elliptic quasi-linear PDE of the order one. We are interested in behavior of solutions of (2.1.1), in particular, when the coefficients J and J_S change. So we need to choose appropriate functional spaces both for solutions and for coefficient of (2.1.1). The authors' choice is based on the following facts:

a) the minimal reasonable smoothness of an almost complex structure J on X , for which the Gromov operator $D_{u,J}$ can be defined, is C^1 , see explicit formula (2.1.6);

b) it is more convenient to operate with Banach spaces and manifolds and thus with finite smoothnesses like C^k , $C^{k,\alpha}$ or $L^{k,p}$, than with C^∞ -smoothness defining only Frechet-type topology, see *Lemmas 3.2.4* and *3.3.1*;

c) the equation (2.1.1) is defined also for u lying in Sobolev-type spaces $L^{k,p}(S, X)$ with $k \geq 1$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, and $kp > 2$; such solutions are C^1 -smooth and the topology on the space of solution is, in fact, independent of the particular choice of such Sobolev space, see *Corollary 3.2.2*.

d) for $J \in C^k$ the coefficients of the Gromov operator $D_{u,J}$ are, in general, only C^{k-1} -continuous, see (2.1.6), and hence solutions of the "tangential equation" $D_{u,J}v = 0$ are only $L^{k,p}$ -smooth, $1 \leq p < \infty$; thus that for obtaining a *smooth* structure on a space

of (parameterized) pseudo-holomorphic curves one should use Sobolev spaces $L^{k',p}(S, X)$ with $k' \leq k$.

Fix a compact Riemannian surface S , i.e. a compact, connected, oriented, smooth manifold of real dimensions 2. Recall, that the Sobolev space $L^{k,p}(S, X)$, $kp > 2$, consists of those continuous maps $u : S \rightarrow X$, which are represented by $L^{k,p}$ -functions in local coordinates on X and S . This is a Banach manifold, and the tangent space $T_u L^{k,p}(S, X)$ to $L^{k,p}(S, X)$ in u is the space $L^{k,p}(S, u^*(TX))$ of all $L^{k,p}$ -sections of the pull-back under u of the tangent bundle TX . Besides, one has the Sobolev imbeddings

$$\begin{aligned} L^{k,p}(S, X) &\hookrightarrow L^{k-1,q}(S, X), & \text{for } 1 \leq p < 2 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq q \leq \frac{2p}{2-p}, \\ L^{k,p}(S, X) &\hookrightarrow C^{k-1,\alpha}(S, X), & \text{for } 2 < p \leq \infty \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 - \frac{2}{p}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1.2)$$

Let $[\gamma]$ be some homology class in $H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})$. Fix p with $2 < p < \infty$ and consider the Banach manifold

$$\mathcal{S} = \{u \in L^{1,p}(S, X) : u(S) \in [\gamma]\}$$

of all $L^{1,p}$ -smooth mappings from S to X , representing the class $[\gamma]$.

Denote by $\mathcal{J}$ the Banach manifold of C^1 -smooth almost complex structures on X . In other words, $\mathcal{J} = \{J \in C^1(X, \text{End}(TX)) : J^2 = -\text{Id}\}$. The tangent space to $\mathcal{J}$ at J consists of C^1 -smooth J -antilinear endomorphisms of TX ,

$$T_J \mathcal{J} = \{I \in C^1(X, \text{End}(TX)) : JI + IJ = 0\} \equiv C^1(X, \Lambda^{0,1} X \otimes TX),$$

where $\Lambda^{0,1} X$ denote the complex bundle of $(0,1)$ -form on X .

Denote by $\mathcal{J}_S$ the Banach manifold of C^1 -smooth complex structures on S . Thus $\mathcal{J}_S = \{J_S \in C^1(S, \text{End}(TS)) : J_S^2 = -\text{Id}\}$ and the tangent space to $\mathcal{J}_S$ at J_S is

$$T_{J_S} \mathcal{J} = \{I \in C^1(S, \text{End}(TS)) : J_S I + I J_S = 0\} \equiv C^1(S, \Lambda^{0,1} S \otimes TS).$$

Consider also the subset $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}_S \times \mathcal{J}$ consisting of all triples (u, J_S, J) with u being (J_S, J) -holomorphic, i.e.

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(u, J_S, J) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}_S \times \mathcal{J} : du + J \circ du \circ J_S = 0\} \quad (2.1.3)$$

Lemma 2.1.1. *Let J and J_S be continuous almost complex structures on X and S respectively, and let $u \in L^{1,p}(S, X)$. Then*

$$du + J \circ du \circ J_S \in L^p(S, \Lambda^{0,1} S \otimes u^*(TX)).$$

Proof. One can easily see that $du \in L^p(S, \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(TS, u^*(TX)))$. On the other hand,

$$(du + J \circ du \circ J_S) \circ J_S = -J \circ (du + J \circ du \circ J_S).$$

which means that $du + J \circ du \circ J_S$ is L^p -integrable $u^*(TX)$ -valued $(0,1)$ -form.

q.e.d.

Consider a Banach bundle $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}_S \times \mathcal{J}$ with a fiber

$$\mathcal{T}_{(u, J_S, J)} = L^p(S, \Lambda^{0,1} S \otimes u^*(TX)),$$

where TS and TX are equipped with complex structures J_S and J respectively. $\mathcal{T}$ has two distinguished sections:

- 1) $\sigma_0 \equiv 0$, the zero section of $\mathcal{T}$;
 - 2) $\sigma_{\bar{\partial}}(u, J_S, J) = du + J \circ du \circ J_S$;
- and by definition $\mathcal{P}$ is the zero-set of $\sigma_{\bar{\partial}}$.

Let us compute the tangent space to $\mathcal{P}$ at the point (u, J_S, J) . Let $(u_t, J_S(t), J(t))$ be a curve in $\mathcal{P}$ such that $(u_0, J_S(0), J(0)) = (u, J_S, J)$. Let

$$(v, \dot{J}_S, \dot{J}) := \left(\frac{du_t}{dt} \Big|_{t=0}, \frac{dJ_S(t)}{dt} \Big|_{t=0}, \frac{dJ(t)}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \right)$$

be the tangent vector to this curve and hence to $\mathcal{P}$ at $t = 0$. The condition $(u_t, J_S(t), J(t)) \in \mathcal{P}$ means that

$$du_t + J(u_t, t) \circ du_t \circ J_S(t) = 0 \quad (2.1.4)$$

in $L^p(S, \Lambda^{0,1}(S) \otimes u_t^*(TX))$. Let ∇ be some symmetric connection on TX , i.e. $\nabla_Y Z - \nabla_Z Y = [Y, Z]$. The covariant differentiation of (2.1.4) with respect to t gives

$$\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}}(du_t) + (\nabla_v J)(du_t \circ J_S) + J(u_t, t) \circ \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}}(du_t) \circ J_S + J \circ du_t \circ \dot{J}_S + \dot{J} \circ du_t \circ J_S = 0$$

Let us show that $\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}}(du_t) = \nabla v$. Indeed, for $\xi \in TS$ one has

$$(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} du_t)(\xi) = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}}[du_t(\xi)] = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} \left(\frac{\partial u_t}{\partial \xi} \right) = \nabla_{\xi} \left(\frac{du_t}{dt} \right) = \nabla_{\xi} v.$$

So every vector $(v, \dot{J}_S, \dot{J})$ which is tangent to $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies the equation

$$\nabla v + J \circ \nabla v \circ J_S + (\nabla_v J) \circ (du \circ J_S) + J \circ du \circ \dot{J}_S + \dot{J} \circ du \circ J_S = 0. \quad (2.1.5)$$

Definition 2.1.1. Let u be a J -holomorphic curve in X . Define the operator $D_{u,J}$ on $L^{1,p}$ -sections v of $u^*(TX)$ as

$$D_{u,J}(v) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\nabla v + J \circ \nabla v \circ J_S + (\nabla_v J) \circ (du \circ J_S) \right) \quad (2.1.6)$$

Remark. This operator plays crucial role in studying properties of pseudo-holomorphic curves. In its definition we use the symmetric connections instead of those compatible with J , as is done in [Gro]. The matter is that one can use the same connection ∇ for changing almost complex structures J . The lemmas below justify our choice.

Lemma 2.1.2. $D_{u,J}$ doesn't depend on the choice of a symmetric connection ∇ and is an $\mathbb{R}$ -linear operator from $L^{1,p}(S, u^*(TX))$ to $L^p(S, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes u^*(TX))$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{\nabla}$ be another symmetric connection on TX . Consider the bilinear tensor on TX , given by formula $Q(Z, Y) := \nabla_Z Y - \tilde{\nabla}_Z Y$. It is easy to see, that Q is symmetric on Z and Y . Note further that $\nabla_\xi v - \tilde{\nabla}_\xi v = \nabla_{du(\xi)} v - \tilde{\nabla}_{du(\xi)} v = Q(du(\xi), v)$ and besides of that $(\nabla_Z J)(Y) - (\tilde{\nabla}_Z J)(Y) = Q(Z, JY) - JQ(Z, Y)$. From here one gets that

$$\begin{aligned} 2(D_{u,J}v)(\xi) - 2(\tilde{D}_{u,J}v)(\xi) &= \nabla_\xi v - \tilde{\nabla}_\xi v + J(\nabla_{J_S \xi} v - \tilde{\nabla}_{J_S \xi} v) + (\nabla_v J - \tilde{\nabla}_v J)du(J_S \xi) = \\ &= Q(du(\xi), v) + JQ(du(J_S \xi), v) + Q(v, Jdu J_S \xi) - JQ(v, du(J_S \xi)) = \\ &= Q(du(\xi), v) + Q(Jdu J_S \xi, v) = Q((du + Jdu J_S)(\xi), v) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now let us show that $D_{u,J}(v)$ is J_S -antilinear:

$$\begin{aligned} 2D_{u,J}(v)[J_S \xi] &= \nabla_{J_S \xi} v + J \circ \nabla_{J_S^2 \xi} v + (\nabla_v J) \circ (du \circ J_S^2)(\xi) = \\ &= \nabla_{J_S \xi} v - J(\nabla_\xi v) - (\nabla_v J)(du(\xi)) = -J[\nabla_\xi v + J(\nabla_{J_S \xi} v) - J\nabla_v Jdu(\xi)] = \\ &= -J[\nabla_\xi v + J \circ \nabla_{J_S \xi} v + (\nabla_v J)(du \circ J_S(\xi))] = -2J D_{u,J}(v)[\xi]. \end{aligned}$$

Here we use the fact that $J \circ \nabla_v J + \nabla_v J \circ J = 0$ and that $du \circ J_S = J \circ du$.

q.e.d.

This lemma allows us to obtain expression (2.1.5) also by computation in local coordinates x_1, x_2 on S and $u_1, \dots, u_{2n}$ on X .

2.2. Operator $\bar{\partial}_{u,J}$ and the holomorphic structure on the induced bundle.

Now we need to understand the structure of operator $D_{u,J}$ in more details. The problem arising here is that $D := D_{u,J}$ is only $\mathbb{R}$ -linear. So we decompose it into the J -linear and J -antilinear parts. For a J -holomorphic curve $u : S \rightarrow X$ denote $u^*(TX)$ by E . Note that the bundle E carries a complex structure, namely J itself or more accurately u^*J . For $\xi \in C^1(S, TS)$ and $v \in L^{1,p}(S, E)$ write $D_\xi v = \frac{1}{2}[D_\xi v - JD_\xi(Jv)] + \frac{1}{2}[D_\xi v + JD_\xi(Jv)] = \bar{\partial}_{u,J}[v](\xi) + R(v, \xi)$.

Definition 2.2.1. The operator $\bar{\partial}_{u,J}$, introduced above as J -linear part of $D_{u,J}$, we shall call the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator for a J -holomorphic curve u .

Lemma 2.2.1. R is continuous J -antilinear operator from E to $\Lambda^{0,1} \otimes E$ of the order zero, satisfying $R \circ du \equiv 0$.

Proof. J antilinearity of R is given by its definition. Compute $R(v, \xi)$ for $v \in L^{1,p}(S, E)$ and $\xi \in C^1(S, TS)$, setting $w := du(\xi)$ and $D := D_{u,J}$ to simplify the notations:

$$\begin{aligned} 4R(v, \xi) &= 2D[v](\xi) + 2JD[Jv](\xi) = \\ &= \nabla_\xi v + J\nabla_{J_S \xi} v + \nabla_v J \circ du \circ J_S(\xi) \\ &\quad + J\nabla_\xi(Jv) + J^2\nabla_{J_S(\xi)}(Jv) + J\nabla_{Jv} J \circ du \circ J_S(\xi) = \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \nabla_\xi v + J\nabla_{J_S\xi} v + \nabla_v J \circ du \circ J_S(\xi) + \\
&+ J^2 \nabla_\xi v + J(\nabla_w J)v + J^3 \nabla_{J_S\xi} v + J^2(\nabla_{J_w J})v + J \circ \nabla_{J_v J} J \circ Jw.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the relations $\nabla_{du(\xi)} J = \nabla_w J$, $du(J_S\xi) = Jw$ and $\nabla_{du(J_S\xi)} J = \nabla_{J_w J}$. Contracting terms we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
4R(v, \xi) &= \nabla_v J(Jw) + J(\nabla_w J)v - (\nabla_{J_w J})v + J(\nabla_{J_v J}(Jw)) = \\
&= (\nabla_v J \circ J)w - (\nabla_w J \circ J)v - (\nabla_{J_w J})v + (\nabla_{J_v J})w = 4N(v, w),
\end{aligned}$$

where $N(v, w)$ denotes the torsion tensor of the almost complex structure J , see [Li], p.183, or [Ko-No], vol.II., p.123, where another normalization constant for the almost complex torsion is used. Finally we obtain

$$R(v, \xi) = N(v, du(\xi)) \quad (2.2.1)$$

N is antisymmetric and J -antilinear on both arguments, so

$$-JR(du(\eta), \xi) = R(du(\eta), J_S\xi) = N(du(\eta), du(J_S\xi)) = N(du(\eta), du(\eta)) = 0$$

if ξ and η were chosen in such a way that $J_S(\xi) = \eta$. The relation $R(du(\xi), \xi) = 0$ obviously follows from (2.2.1).

q.e.d.

The J -linear operator $\bar{\partial}_{u,J} : L^{1,p}(S, E) \rightarrow L^p(S, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes E)$ defines in a standard way, see Appendix for the proof, a holomorphic structure on the bundle E . This follows from the fact that due to one-dimensionality of S there is no integrability condition on the operator $\bar{\partial}$. The sheaf of holomorphic sections of E we shall denote by $\mathcal{O}(E)$. The tangent bundle TS to our Riemannian surface also carries a natural holomorphic structure. We shall denote by $\mathcal{O}(TS)$ the corresponding analytic sheaf.

Lemma 2.2.2. *Let $u : (S, J_S) \rightarrow (X, J)$ be a nonconstant pseudo-holomorphic curve in almost complex manifold X . Then du defines an injective analytic morphism of analytic sheaves*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(TS) \xrightarrow{du} \mathcal{O}(E) \quad (2.2.2)$$

where $E = u^*(TX)$ is equipped with holomorphic structure defined as above by operator $\bar{\partial}_{u,J}$.

Proof. Injectivity of a sheaf homomorphism is equivalent to its nondegeneracy, which is our case.

To prove holomorphicity of du it is sufficient to show that for $\xi, \eta \in C^1(S, TS)$ one has

$$(\bar{\partial}_{u,J}(du(\xi)))(\eta) = du((\bar{\partial}_S\xi)(\eta)) \quad (2.2.3)$$

where $\bar{\partial}_S$ is the usual $\bar{\partial}$ -operator on TS . We shall use the relation, which is in fact the definition for $\bar{\partial}_S$:

$$(\bar{\partial}_S \xi)(\eta) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_\eta \xi + J_S \nabla_{J_S \eta} \xi) \quad (2.2.4)$$

Here ∇ is a symmetric connection on S , compatible with J_S . One has

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \cdot (\bar{\partial}_{u,J} du(\xi))(\eta) &= \nabla_\eta (du(\xi)) + J \nabla_{J_S \eta} (du(\xi)) + (\nabla_{du(\xi)} J)(du(J_S \eta)) = \\ &= (\nabla_\eta du)(\xi) + du(\nabla_\eta \xi) + J(\nabla_{J_S \eta} du)(\xi) + J(du(\nabla_{J_S \eta} \xi)) + (\nabla_{du(\xi)} J)(du(J_S \eta)) = \\ &= du[\nabla_\eta \xi + J_S \nabla_{J_S \eta} \xi] + [(\nabla_\eta du)(\xi) + J(\nabla_{J_S \eta} du)(\xi) + (\nabla_{du(\xi)} J)(du(J_S \eta))]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2.5)$$

The first term of (2.2.5) is $2 \cdot du(\bar{\partial}_S \xi)(\eta)$. To cancel the second one we use the identities $(\nabla_\xi du)[\eta] = (\nabla_\eta du)[\xi]$, $\nabla_w J \circ J = -J \circ \nabla_w J$, and $(\nabla_\xi du) \circ J_S = J \circ (\nabla_\xi du) + \nabla_{du(\xi)} J \circ du$. The last identity is obtained via covariant differentiation of $du \circ J_S = J \circ du$. Consequently we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nabla_\eta du)(\xi) + J(\nabla_{J_S \eta} du)(\xi) + (\nabla_{du(\xi)} J)(du(J_S \eta)) = \\ &(\nabla_\xi du)(\eta) + J(\nabla_\xi du)(J_S \eta) + (\nabla_{du(\xi)} J)(du(J_S \eta)) = \\ &(\nabla_\xi du)(\eta) + J^2(\nabla_\xi du)(\eta) + J(\nabla_{du(\xi)} J)(du(\eta)) + (\nabla_{du(\xi)} J)(du(J_S \eta)) = \\ &= (J \circ \nabla_{du \xi} J)(du \eta) + (\nabla_{du(\xi)} J \circ J)(du(\eta)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

q.e.d.

Remark. We can give an alternative proof of both *Lemmas 2.2.1* and *2.2.2*, which does not use direct calculation. Fix a complex structure J_S on S and let ϕ_t be the one parameter group of diffeomorphisms of S , generated by a vector field ξ . Then $\frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0}(\bar{\partial}\phi_t) = D_{J_S, \text{id}}\xi = \bar{\partial}\xi$. Let a J -holomorphic map $u : S \rightarrow X$ be also fixed. Then $\frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0}(u \circ \phi_t) = du(\xi)$ and consequently

$$D_{J,u}(du(\xi)) = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \bar{\partial}_J(u \circ \phi_t) = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} (du \circ \bar{\partial}\phi_t) = du \left(\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} (\bar{\partial}_{J_S} \phi_t) \right) = du(\bar{\partial}\xi)$$

or equivalently $D_{J,u} \circ du = du \circ \bar{\partial}$. Taking J -antilinear part of last equality we obtain $R \circ du = 0$. Nevertheless we shall use the explicit form of the antilinear part of the Gromov operator given in (2.2.1).

The zeros of analytic morphism $du : \mathcal{O}(TS) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(E)$ are isolated. So we have the following

Corollary 2.2.3. ([Sk]). *The set of critical points of pseudo-holomorphic curve in almost complex manifold (X, J) is discrete, provided J is of class C^1 .*

For C^∞ -structures this result is due to McDuff, see [McD-3].

The *Lemma 2.2.2* makes possible to give the following

Definition 2.2.2. By the order of zero $\text{ord}_p du$ of the differential du at a point $p \in S$ we shall understand the order of vanishing at p of the holomorphic morphism $du : \mathcal{O}(TS) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(E)$.

From (2.2.2) we obtain the following short exact sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(TS) \xrightarrow{du} \mathcal{O}(E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N} \longrightarrow 0. \quad (2.2.6)$$

Here $\mathcal{N}$ is a quotient-sheaf $\mathcal{O}(E)/du(TS)$. We can decompose $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{O}(N_0) \oplus \mathcal{N}_1$, where N_0 is a holomorphic vector bundle and $\mathcal{N}_1 = \bigoplus_{i=1}^P \mathbb{C}_{a_i}^{n_i}$. Here $\mathbb{C}_{a_i}^{n_i}$ denotes the sheaf, supported at the critical points $a_i \in S$ of du and having a stalk $\mathbb{C}^{n_i}$ with $n_i = \text{ord}_{a_i} du$, the order of zero of du at a_i .

Denote by $[A]$ the divisor $\sum_{i=1}^P n_i [a_i]$, and by $\mathcal{O}([A])$ a sheaf of meromorphic functions on S having poles in a_i of order at most n_i . Then (2.2.6) give rise to the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(TS) \otimes \mathcal{O}([A]) \xrightarrow{du} \mathcal{O}(E) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(N_0) \longrightarrow 0. \quad (2.2.7)$$

Denote by $L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E)$ the spaces of L^p -integrable $(0, 1)$ -forms with coefficients in E . Then (2.2.3) together with Lemma 2.2.1 implies that the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & L^{1,p}(S, TS \otimes [A]) & \xrightarrow{du} & L^{1,p}(S, E) & \xrightarrow{pr} & L^{1,p}(S, N_0) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \bar{\partial}_S & & \downarrow D_{u,J} & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & L_{(0,1)}^p(S, TS \otimes [A]) & \xrightarrow{du} & L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E) & \longrightarrow & L_{(0,1)}^p(S, N_0) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} \quad (2.2.8)$$

This defines an operator $D_{u,J}^N : L^{1,p}(S, N_0) \longrightarrow L_{(0,1)}^p(S, N_0)$ which is of the form $D_{u,J}^N = \bar{\partial}_N + R$. Here $\bar{\partial}_N$ is a usual $\bar{\partial}$ -operator on N_0 and $R \in C^0(S, \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(N_0, \Lambda^{0,1} \otimes N_0))$. This follows from the fact that $D_{u,J}$ has the same form, see Definition 2.2.1.

Definition 2.2.3. Let E be a holomorphic vector bundle over a compact Riemannian surface S and let $D : L^{1,p}(S, E) \rightarrow L^p(S, \Lambda^{0,1} S \otimes E)$ be an operator of the form $D = \bar{\partial} + R$ where $R \in L^p(S, \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(E, \Lambda^{0,1} S \otimes E))$ with $2 < p < \infty$. Define $H_D^0(S, E) := \text{Ker } D$ and $H_D^1(S, E) := \text{Coker } D$.

Remark. It is shown in Lemma 2.3.2 below that for given S, E and $R \in L^p$, $2 < p < \infty$, one can define $H_D^i(S, E)$ as (co)kernel of the operator $\bar{\partial} + R : L^{1,q}(S, E) \rightarrow L^q(S, \Lambda^{0,1} S \otimes E)$ for any $1 < q \leq p$. So the definition is independent of the choice of functional space.

By the standard lemma of homological algebra we get from (2.2.8) the following long exact sequence of D -cohomologies.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H^0(S, TS \otimes [A]) & \longrightarrow & H_D^0(S, E) & \longrightarrow & H_D^0(S, N_0) \xrightarrow{\delta} \\ & & & & & & \\ & & \longrightarrow & H^1(S, TS \otimes [A]) & \longrightarrow & H_D^1(S, E) & \longrightarrow H_D^1(S, N_0) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array} \quad (2.2.9)$$

2.3. Surjectivity of $D_{u,J}$.

For the Step 2 of the Theorem 1 we shall need a result of Gromov ([Gro]) and Hofer-Lizan-Sikorav ([Hf-L-Sk]) about surjectivity of $D_{u,J}^N$, namely a vanishing theorem for D -cohomologies. First we prove some technical statements.

Lemma 2.3.1. *Let X and Y be Banach spaces and $T : X \rightarrow Y$ a closed dense defined unbounded operator with the graph $\Gamma = \Gamma_T$ endowed with the graph norm $\|x\|_\Gamma = \|x\|_X + \|Tx\|_Y$. Suppose that the natural map $\Gamma \rightarrow X$ is compact. Then*

- i) $\text{Ker}(T)$ is finite-dimensional;
- ii) $\text{Im}(T)$ is closed;
- iii) the dual space $(Y/\text{Im}(T))^*$ is naturally isomorphic to $\text{Ker}(T^* : Y^* \rightarrow X^*)$.

Proof. Obviously, for $x \in \text{Ker}(T)$ one has $\|x\|_X = \|x\|_\Gamma$. Let $\{x_n\}$ be a sequence in $\text{Ker}(T)$ which is bounded in $\|\cdot\|_X$ norm. Then it is bounded in $\|\cdot\|_\Gamma$ norm and hence relatively compact with respect to $\|\cdot\|_X$ norm. Thus the unit ball in $\text{Ker}(T)$ is compact which implies the statement i) of the lemma.

Due to finite-dimensionality, there exists a closed complement X_0 to $\text{Ker}(T)$ in X . Let $\{x_n\}$ be a sequence in X such that $Tx_n \rightarrow y \in Y$. Without losing generality we may assume that x_n belong to X_0 . Suppose that $\|x_n\|_X \rightarrow \infty$. Denote $\tilde{x}_n := \frac{x_n}{\|x_n\|_X}$. Then $\|\tilde{x}_n\|_\Gamma$ is bounded and hence some subsequence of $\{\tilde{x}_n\}$, still denoted by $\{\tilde{x}_n\}$, converges in X_0 to some $\tilde{x}$. Note that $\tilde{x} \neq 0$ because $\|\tilde{x}\|_X = \lim \|\tilde{x}_n\|_X = 1$. On the other hand, one can see that $T\tilde{x}_n \rightarrow 0 \in Y$. Since Γ is closed, $(\tilde{x}, 0) \in \Gamma$ and hence $\tilde{x} \in \text{Ker}(T) \cap X_0 = \{0\}$. The contradiction shows that the sequence $\{x_n\}$ must be bounded in X . Since $\{Tx_n\}$ is also bounded in Y , some subsequence of $\{x_n\}$, still denoted by $\{x_n\}$, converges in X_0 to some x . Due to the closeness of Γ , $Tx = y$. Thus $\text{Im}(T)$ is closed in Y .

Denote $Z := \text{Ker}(T^* : Y^* \rightarrow X^*)$ and let $h \in (Y/\text{Im}(T))^*$. Then h defines a linear functional on Y , i.e. some element $h' \in Y^*$, which is identically zero on $\text{Im}(T)$. Thus for any x from the domain of definition of T one has $\langle h', Tx \rangle = 0$, which implies $T^*(h') = 0$. Consequently, h' belongs to Z . Conversely, every $h' \in Z$ is a linear functional on Y with $h'(Tx) = \langle T^*h', x \rangle = 0$ for every x from the domain of definition of T . Thus h' is identically zero on $\text{Im}(T)$ and is defined by some unique $h \in (Y/\text{Im}(T))^*$.

q.e.d.

Lemma 2.3.2. (Serre duality for D -cohomologies.) *Let E be a holomorphic vector bundle over a compact Riemannian surface S and let $D : L^{1,p}(S, E) \rightarrow L^p(S, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes E)$ be an operator of the form $D = \bar{\partial} + R$ where $R \in L^p(S, \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(E, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes E))$ with $2 < p < \infty$. Let also $K := \Lambda^{1,0}S$ be the canonical holomorphic line bundle of S . Then there exists the naturally defined operator*

$$D^* = \bar{\partial} - R^* : L^{1,p}(S, E^* \otimes K) \rightarrow L^p(S, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes E^* \otimes K)$$

with $R^* \in L^p(S, \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(E^* \otimes K, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes E^* \otimes K))$ and the natural isomorphisms

$$H_D^0(S, E)^* \cong H_{D^*}^1(S, E^* \otimes K),$$

$$\mathbf{H}_D^1(S, E)^* \cong \mathbf{H}_{D^*}^0(S, E^* \otimes K).$$

If, in addition, R is $\mathbb{C}$ -antilinear, then R^* is also $\mathbb{C}$ -antilinear.

Proof. For any $1 < q \leq p$ we associate with D an unbounded dense defined operator T_q from $X_q := L^q(S, E)$ into $Y_q := L^q(S, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes E)$ with the domain of definition $L^{1,q}(S, E)$. The elliptic regularity of D (see Lemma 3.2.1 below) implies that

$$\|\xi\|_{L^{1,q}(S, E)} \leq C(q) (\|\bar{\partial}\xi + R\xi\|_{L^q(S, E)} + \|\xi\|_{L^q(S, E)}).$$

Consequently, T_q are closed and satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 2.3.1. For $q > q_1$ we have also the natural imbedding $X_q \hookrightarrow X_{q_1}$ and $Y_q \hookrightarrow Y_{q_1}$ which commutes with the operator D . Moreover, due to regularity of D this imbedding maps $\text{Ker } T_q$ identically onto $\text{Ker } T_{q_1}$. Thus we can identify $\mathbf{H}_D^0(S, E)$ with any $\text{Ker } T_q$.

Now note that for $q' := q/(q-1)$ we have the natural isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} X_q^* &\equiv (L^q(S, E))^* \cong L^{q'}(S, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes E^* \otimes K), \\ Y_q^* &\equiv (L^q(S, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes E))^* \cong L^{q'}(S, E^* \otimes K), \end{aligned}$$

induced by pairing of E with E^* and by integration over S . One can easily check that the dual operator T_q^* is induced by the differential operator $-D^* : L^{1,q'}(S, E^* \otimes K) \rightarrow L^{q'}(S, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes E^* \otimes K)$ of the form $D^* = \bar{\partial} - R^*$. Really, for $\xi \in L^{1,q}(S, E)$ and $\eta \in L^{1,q'}(S, E^* \otimes K)$ one has

$$\langle T_q \xi, \eta \rangle = \int_S \langle \bar{\partial}\xi + R\xi, \eta \rangle = \int_S \bar{\partial} \langle \xi, \eta \rangle + \int_S \langle \xi, -(\bar{\partial} - R^*)\eta \rangle = \int_S \langle \xi, -D^* \eta \rangle,$$

since the integral of any $\bar{\partial}$ -exact $(1,1)$ -form vanishes. From Lemma 2.3.1 we obtain the natural isomorphisms $\mathbf{H}_D^1(S, E)^* \equiv (\text{Coker } T_p)^* \cong \text{Ker } T_p^*$ and $\mathbf{H}_D^0(S, E)^* \equiv (\text{Ker } T_p)^* \cong \text{Coker } T_p^*$, which yields the statement of the lemma.

q.e.d.

Corollary 2.3.3. ([Gro], [H-L-Sk].) (Vanishing theorem for D -cohomologies.) Let S be a Riemannian surface S of the genus g . Let also L be a holomorphic line bundle over S , equipped with a differential operator $D = \bar{\partial} + R$ with $R \in L^p(S, \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(L, \Lambda^{0,1}S \otimes L))$, $p > 2$. If $c_1(L) < 0$, then $\mathbf{H}_D^0(S, L) = 0$. If $c_1(L) > 2g - 2$, then $\mathbf{H}_D^1(S, L) = 0$.

Proof. Suppose ξ is a nontrivial $L^{1,p}$ -section of L satisfying $D\xi = 0$. Then due to Lemma 3.1.1, ξ has only finitely many zeros $p_i \in S$ with positive multiplicities μ_i . One can easily see that $c_1(L) = \sum \mu_i \geq 0$. Consequently $\mathbf{H}_D^0(S, L)$ vanishes if $c_1(L) < 0$. The vanishing result for $\mathbf{H}_D^1$ is obtained via the Serre duality of Lemma 2.3.2.

q.e.d.

2.4. Deformation of cusp-curves.

Recall that in (2.2.9) we have obtained the following long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(S, TS \otimes [A]) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_D^0(S, E) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_D^0(S, N_0) \xrightarrow{\delta} \\
&\longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(S, TS \otimes [A]) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_D^1(S, E) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}_D^1(S, N_0) \longrightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

It is more important for us, that we can associated a similar long exact sequence of D -cohomologies also to the short exact sequence (2.2.6). Note, that due to the *Lemmas 2.2.1, 2.2.2* and *Corollary 2.2.3* we obtain the short exact sequence of complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & L^{1,p}(S, TS) & \xrightarrow{du} & L^{1,p}(S, E) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\mathrm{pr}}} & L^{1,p}(S, E) / du(L^{1,p}(S, TS)) \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow \overline{\partial}_S & & \downarrow D & & \downarrow \overline{D} \\
0 & \longrightarrow & L_{(0,1)}^p(S, TS) & \xrightarrow{du} & L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E) & \longrightarrow & L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E) / du(L_{(0,1)}^p(S, TS)) \longrightarrow 0
\end{array} \tag{2.4.1}$$

where $\overline{D}$ is induced by $D \equiv D_{u,J}$.

Lemma 2.4.1. *For $\overline{D}$ just defined, $\mathrm{Ker} \overline{D} = \mathrm{H}_D^0(S, N_0) \oplus \mathrm{H}^0(S, \mathcal{N}_1)$ and $\mathrm{Coker} \overline{D} = \mathrm{H}_D^1(S, N_0)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathrm{pr}_0 : \mathcal{O}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(N_0)$ and $\mathrm{pr}_1 : \mathcal{O}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_1$ denote the natural projections induced by $\mathrm{pr} : \mathcal{O}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \equiv \mathcal{O}(N_0) \oplus \mathcal{N}_1$. Let also A as in (2.2.7) denote the support of $\mathcal{N}_1$, i.e. the finite set of the vanishing points of du . Then pr_0 defines maps

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{pr}_0 : L^{1,p}(S, E) &\longrightarrow L^{1,p}(S, N_0) \\
\mathrm{pr}_0 : L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E) &\longrightarrow L_{(0,1)}^p(S, N_0)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.2}$$

Further, in a neighbourhood of every point $p \in A$ the sequence (2.2.6) can be represented in the form

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{\alpha_p} \mathcal{O}^{n-1} \oplus \mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{\beta_p} \mathcal{O}^{n-1} \oplus \mathcal{N}_1|_p \longrightarrow 0 \tag{2.4.3}$$

with $\alpha_p(\xi) = (0, z^{\nu_p} \xi)$ and $\beta(\xi, \eta) = (\xi, j_p^{(\nu-1)} \eta)$. Here z denotes local holomorphic coordinate on S with $z(p) = 0$, ν_p is the multiplicity of du in p , $j_p^{(\nu-1)} \eta$ is a $(\nu-1)$ -jet of η in p , and $\mathcal{N}_1|_p$ is a stalk of $\mathcal{N}_1$ in p .

Now let $\overline{\xi} \in L^{1,p}(S, E)/du(L^{1,p}(S, TS))$ and satisfies $\overline{D}(\overline{\xi}) = 0$. This means that $\overline{\xi}$ is represented by some $\xi \in L^{1,p}(S, E)$ with $D\xi = du(\eta)$ for some $\eta \in L_{(0,1)}^p(S, TS)$. It is obvious that there exists $\zeta \in L^{1,p}(S, TS)$ such that $\overline{\partial}\zeta = \eta$ in a neighbourhood of A . Consequently, $D(\xi - du(\zeta)) = 0$ in a neighbourhood of A . Denote $\xi_1 := \xi - du(\zeta)$. Due to (2.2.1), in a neighbourhood of $p \in A$ the equation $D\xi_1 = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\overline{\partial}\xi_1 + N(\xi_1, du) = 0.$$

Due to the *Lemma 3.1.2* below, $\xi_1 = P(z) + o(|z|^{\nu_p})$ with some (holomorphic) polynomial $P(z)$. This gives possibility to define $\varphi_0 := \mathrm{pr}_0(\xi) \in L^{1,p}(S, N_0)$ and $\varphi_1 := \mathrm{pr}_1(\xi - du(\zeta)) \in$

$H^0(S, \mathcal{N}_1)$. Due to (2.2.7) and (2.2.8), $D_N \varphi_0 = 0$. If $\bar{\partial} \zeta' = \eta$ in a neighbourhood of A for some other $\zeta' \in L^{1,p}(S, TS)$, then $\zeta - \zeta'$ is holomorphic in a neighbourhood of A , and consequently $\text{pr}_1(du(\zeta - \zeta')) = 0$. Thus the map $\iota^0 : \text{Ker } \bar{D} \rightarrow H_D^0(S, N_0) \oplus H^0(S, \mathcal{N}_1)$, $\iota^0(\bar{\xi}) = (\varphi_0, \varphi_1)$ is well-defined.

Assume that $\iota^0(\bar{\xi}) = 0$ for some $\bar{\xi} \in \text{Ker } \bar{D}$ and that $\bar{\xi}$ is represented by $\xi \in L^{1,p}(S, E)$ with $D\xi = du(\eta)$ for some $\eta \in L_{(0,1)}^p(S, TS)$. Let $\zeta \in L^{1,p}(S, TS)$ satisfies $\bar{\partial}\zeta = \eta$ in a neighbourhood of A . The assumption $\iota^0(\bar{\xi}) = 0$ implies that $\text{pr}_1(\xi - du(\zeta)) = 0$ and that $\text{pr}_0(\xi - du(\zeta)) = 0$ in a neighbourhood of A . Consequently, $\xi - du(\zeta) = du(\psi)$ for some $\psi \in L^{1,p}(S, TS)$ and $\xi \in du(L^{1,p}(S, TS))$. This means that $\bar{\xi} = 0 \in \text{Ker } \bar{D}$ and ι^0 is injective.

Let $\varphi_0 \in H_D^0(S, N_0)$ and $\varphi_1 \in H^0(S, \mathcal{N}_1)$. For every $p \in A$ fix a neighbourhood U_p and representation of (2.2.6) in form (2.4.3) over U_p . In every U_p we can find $\xi = (\xi_0, \xi_1) \in L^{1,p}(U_p, \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C})$ satisfying the following properties:

- a) $D\xi = 0$;
- b) ξ_0 coincide with $\varphi_0|_{U_p}$ under the identification $\mathcal{O}(N_0)|_{U_p} \cong \mathcal{O}^{n-1}$;
- c) $j_p^{(\nu-1)}\xi = \varphi_1|_p \in \mathcal{N}_1|_p$.

Corresponding $\xi_1 \in L^{1,p}(U_p, \mathbb{C})$ can be constructed as follows. Let $D(\xi_0, \xi_1) = (\eta_0, \eta_1)$. From $\text{pr}_0(D\xi) = D_N(\text{pr}_0\xi) = 0$ one has $\eta_0 = 0$. In the representation (2.4.3) the identity $R \circ du = 0$ of Lemma 2.2.1 means that $D(0, \xi_1) = (0, \bar{\partial}\xi_1)$. So one can find ξ_1 with $\bar{\partial}\xi_1 = -\eta_1$, which gives $D(\xi_0, \xi_1) = 0$. Consequently, $j_p^{(\nu-1)}\xi$ is well-defined. Adding an appropriate holomorphic term to ξ_1 one can satisfy the condition c). Using an appropriate partition of unity we can construct $\xi' \in L^{1,p}(S, E)$ such that ξ' coincide with ξ in a (possibly smaller) neighbourhood of every $p \in A$ and such that $\text{pr}_0\xi' = \varphi_0$ in S . Thus from $D_N\varphi_0 = 0$ and (2.2.8) one get $D\xi' \in du(L_{(0,1)}^p(S, TS \otimes [A]))$. But $D\xi' = 0$ in a neighbourhood of every $p \in A$, which means that $D\xi' \in du(L_{(0,1)}^p(S, TS))$. This shows surjectivity of $\iota^0 : \text{Ker } \bar{D} \rightarrow H_D^0(S, N_0) \oplus H^0(S, \mathcal{N}_1)$.

Now consider the case of $\text{Coker } \bar{D}$. Since the operator pr_0 satisfies the identities $\text{pr}_0 \circ D_E = D_N \circ \text{pr}_0$ and $\text{pr}_0 \circ du = 0$, the induced map

$$\begin{aligned} \iota^1 : \text{Coker } \bar{D} \equiv L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E) / (D_E(L^{1,p}(S, E) \oplus du(L_{(0,1)}^p(S, TS))) &\longrightarrow \\ &\longrightarrow H_D^1(S, N_0) \equiv L_{(0,1)}^p(S, N_0) / D_N(L^{1,p}(S, N_0)), \end{aligned}$$

is well-defined. More over, the surjectivity of $\text{pr}_0 : L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E) \rightarrow L_{(0,1)}^p(S, N_0)$ easily yields the surjectivity of ι^1 .

Assume now that $\iota^1\bar{\xi} = 0$ for some $\bar{\xi} \in \text{Coker } \bar{D}$, and that $\bar{\xi}$ is represented by $\xi \in L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E)$. Then the condition $\iota^1\bar{\xi} = 0$ means that $\text{pr}_0\xi = D_N\eta$ for some $\eta \in L^{1,p}(S, N_0)$. Find $\zeta \in L^{1,p}(S, E)$, such that $\text{pr}_0\zeta = \eta$. Then $\text{pr}_0(\xi - D\zeta) = 0$, and due to (2.2.8), $\xi - D\zeta = du(\varphi)$ for some $\varphi \in L_{(0,1)}^p(S, TS \otimes [A])$. Find $\psi \in L^{1,p}(S, TS \otimes [A])$, such that $\bar{\partial}\psi = \varphi$ in some neighbourhood of A . Then

$$\xi - D\zeta - D(du(\psi)) = du(\varphi - \bar{\partial}\psi) \in du(L_{(0,1)}^p(S, TS)).$$

Consequently, $\bar{\xi} \in \text{Im } \bar{D}$. This shows the injectivity of ι^1 .

q.e.d.

Corollary 2.4.2. *The short exact sequence (2.2.6) induces the long exact sequence of D -cohomologies*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}^0(S, TS) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_D^0(S, E) \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_D^0(S, N_0) \oplus \mathbf{H}^0(S, \mathcal{N}_1) \xrightarrow{\delta} \\ &\longrightarrow \mathbf{H}^1(S, TS) \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_D^1(S, E) \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_D^1(S, N_0) \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that $(u, J_S, J) \in \mathcal{P}$, i.e. u belongs to $C^1(S, X)$ and satisfies the equation $du \circ J_S = J \circ du$. Set

$$T_{(u, J_S, J)}\mathcal{P} := \{ (v, \dot{J}_S, \dot{J}) \in T_u\mathcal{S} \times T_{J_S}\mathcal{J}_S \times T_J\mathcal{J} : 2D_{u, J}v + \dot{J} \circ du \circ J_S + \dot{J}_S \circ du \circ J = 0 \}.$$

Let $\text{pr}_{\mathcal{J}} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}_S \times \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ and $\text{pr}_{(u, J_S, J)} : T_{(u, J_S, J)}\mathcal{P} \rightarrow T_J\mathcal{J}$ denote the natural projections.

Theorem 2. *The map $\text{pr}_{(u, J_S, J)} : T_{(u, J_S, J)}\mathcal{P} \rightarrow T_J\mathcal{J}$ is surjective iff $\mathbf{H}_D^1(S, N_0) = 0$, and then the following holds:*

- i) *the kernel $\text{Ker}(\text{pr}_{(u, J_S, J)})$ admits a closed complementing space;*
- ii) *for $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{J}_S, \tilde{J}) \in \mathcal{P}$ close enough to (u, J_S, J) the projection $\text{pr}_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{J}_S, \tilde{J})}$ is also surjective;*
- iii) *for some neighbourhood $U \subset \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}_S \times \mathcal{J}$ of (u, J_S, J) the set $\mathcal{P} \cap U$ is a Banach submanifold of U with the tangent space $T_{(u, J_S, J)}\mathcal{P}$ at (u, J_S, J) ;*
- iv) *there exists a C^1 -map f from some neighbourhood V of $J \in \mathcal{J}$ into U with $f(V) \subset \mathcal{P}$, $f(J) = (u, J_S, J)$, and $\text{pr}_{\mathcal{J}} \circ f = \text{Id}_V$, such that $\text{Im}(df : T_J\mathcal{J} \rightarrow T_{(u, J_S, J)}\mathcal{P})$ is complementing to $\text{Ker}(\text{pr}_{(u, J_S, J)})$.*

Proof. Denote by $\tilde{A}$ the set of singular point of $M = u(S)$, i.e. the set of cuspidal and self-intersection points of M . Let $\xi \in L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E)$. Using the local solvability of the D -equation (proved essentially in Lemma 3.2.1 below) and an appropriate partition of unity we can find $\eta \in L^{1,p}(S, E)$, such that $\xi - 2D\eta \in C_{(0,1)}^1(S, E)$ and $\xi - 2D\eta = 0$ in a neighbourhood of $\tilde{A}$. Then we find $\dot{J} \in T_J\mathcal{J} \equiv C_{(0,1)}^1(X, TX)$ such that $\dot{J} \circ du \circ J_S = \xi - 2D\eta$. The surjectivity of $\text{pr}_{(u, J_S, J)}$ and Lemma 2.4.1 easily yield the identity $\mathbf{H}_D^1(S, N_0) = 0$.

From now on and till the end of the proof we suppose that $\mathbf{H}_D^1(S, N_0) = 0$.

Let ds^2 be some Hermitian metric on S and let $\mathcal{H}_{(0,1)} \subset C_{(0,1)}^1(S, TS)$ be a space of ds^2 -harmonic TS -valued $(0,1)$ -forms on S . Then the natural map $\mathcal{H}_{(0,1)} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^1(S, TS)$ is an isomorphism. Further, due to the Corollary 2.4.2 the map

$$g := (du, 2D) : \mathcal{H}_{(0,1)} \oplus L^{1,p}(S, E) \rightarrow L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E)$$

is surjective and has a finite-dimensional kernel. Consequently there exists a closed subspace $Y \subset \mathcal{H}_{(0,1)} \oplus L^{1,p}(S, E)$, such that $g : Y \rightarrow L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E)$ is an isomorphism. Let

$$h = (h_{TS}, h_E) : L_{(0,1)}^p(S, E) \rightarrow Y \subset \mathcal{H}_{(0,1)} \oplus L^{1,p}(S, E)$$

be the inversion of $g|_Y$.

Take $\dot{J} \in T_J \mathcal{J} = \{I \in C^1(X, \text{End}(TX)) : JI + IJ = 0\} \equiv C^1_{(0,1)}(X, TX)$. Then $\dot{J} \circ du \circ J_S$ lies in $C^0_{(0,1)}(S, E)$. Let $h(\dot{J} \circ du \circ J_S) = (\xi, \eta)$ with $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_{(0,1)} \subset C^1_{(0,1)}(S, TS)$ and $\eta \in L^{1,p}(S, E)$. Then we obtain that

$$2D(-\eta) + \dot{J} \circ du \circ J_S + J \circ du(J_S \xi) = 0, \quad (2.4.4)$$

where we used the identity $J \circ du \circ J_S = -du$. Using the identity $T_{J_S} \mathcal{J}_S = C^1_{(0,1)}(S, TS)$ we conclude that the formula $F(\dot{J}) = (J_S h_{TS}(\dot{J} \circ du \circ J_S), -h_E(\dot{J} \circ du \circ J_S), \dot{J})$ defines a linear bounded operator $F : T_J \mathcal{J} \rightarrow T_{(u, J_S, J)} \mathcal{P}$, such that $\text{pr}_{(u, J_S, J)} \circ F = \text{Id}_{T_J \mathcal{J}}$. In particular, $\text{H}^1_D(S, N_0) = 0$ implies the surjectivity of $\text{pr}_{(u, J_S, J)}$.

The image of the just defined operator F is closed, because the convergence of $F(\dot{J}_n)$, $J_n \in T_J \mathcal{J}$, obviously yields the convergence of $J_n = \text{pr}_{(u, J_S, J)} \circ F(\dot{J}_n)$. One can easily see that $\text{Im}(F)$ is a closed complementing space to $\text{Ker}(\text{pr}_{(u, J_S, J)})$.

Further, for $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{J}_S, \tilde{J}) \in \mathcal{P}$ close enough to (u, J_S, J) the map $\tilde{g} := (d\tilde{u}, 2D_{\tilde{u}, \tilde{J}}) : Y \rightarrow L^p_{(0,1)}(S, \tilde{E})$ is also an isomorphism. This implies the surjectivity $\text{pr}_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{J}_S, \tilde{J})}$.

The statements iii) and iv) can be easily obtained from ii) and the implicit function theorem.

q.e.d.

Let now $\mathcal{J}_S$ denote the space of all $C^{0,\alpha}$ -continuous complex structures on S with some $0 < \alpha < 1$ and let g be the genus of S . Denote by $\mathcal{G}$ the space $\mathcal{D}^{1,\alpha}_{\text{diff}}(S)$ of all $C^{1,\alpha}$ -diffeomorphisms of S . This is a Banach group with the C^1 -continuous group operation given by composition, and with the tangent space $T_{\text{Id}} \mathcal{G} = C^{1,\alpha}(S, TS)$. One has also the natural C^1 -actions of $\mathcal{G}$ on $\mathcal{S}$ and on $\mathcal{J}_S$ given by relations

$$\begin{aligned} h \in \mathcal{G}, u \in \mathcal{S} &\longrightarrow h * u := u \circ h^{-1} \\ h \in \mathcal{G}, J_S \in \mathcal{J}_S &\longrightarrow h * J_S := dh \circ J_S \circ dh^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4.5)$$

so that $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}_S \times \mathcal{J}$ is invariant with respect to the diagonal action of $\mathcal{G}$. The *Moduli space of nonparametrized pseudo-holomorphic curves* is now define as a quotient space $\mathcal{M}_{[\gamma],g} := \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{G}$ with the natural projection $\text{pr}_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M}_{[\gamma],g} \rightarrow \mathcal{J}$, and the fiber $\mathcal{M}_{[\gamma],g,J} := \text{pr}_{\mathcal{M}}^{-1}(J)$ is called the *Moduli space of nonparametrized J -holomorphic curves*. Informally speaking, this is a topologization of a set of J -holomorphic curves $M \subset X$, which can be parameterized by S .

The relation $h * J_S = J'_S$ is equivalent to (J_S, J'_S) -holomorphicity of the map $h : S \rightarrow S$. So due to the regularity property of $\bar{\partial}$ -operator, see the *Corollary 3.2.2*, the chosen smoothnesses of complex structures and diffeomorphisms of S are more convenient for description of the Moduli spaces then, for example, $J_S \in C^1$.

The Moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{[\gamma],g,J}$ appears as an important object in the theory of *quantum cohomology*, which is also known as *Gromov-Witten invariants theory*, see [McD-S]. One of the problems, arising by studying Moduli spaces, is to obtain the regularity property of $\mathcal{M}_{[\gamma],g,J}$ for given $[\gamma]$, S , and J .

One get a partial result in this directions using *Lemma 2.4.1* and *Theorem 2*.

Corollary 2.4.3. *Let $u : (S, J_S) \rightarrow (X, J)$ be a nonconstant irreducible pseudo-holomorphic map, such that $H_D^1(S, N_0) = 0$. Than in a neighbourhood of $M := u(S)$ the Moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{[\gamma], g, J}$ is a manifold with the tangent space $T_M \mathcal{M}_{[\gamma], g, J} = H_D^0(S, N_0) \oplus H^0(S, \mathcal{N}_1)$.*

Proof. The considerations similar to ones from the *Theorem 2* shows that $\mathcal{P}_J$ is a Banach manifold with the tangent space

$$T_{(u, J_S)} \mathcal{P}_J = \{ (v, \dot{J}_S) \in L^{1,p}(S, E) \times C_{(0,1)}^{0,\alpha}(S, TS) : 2D_{u,J}v + J \circ du \circ \dot{J}_S = 0 \},$$

which is linearly (not topologically!) isomorphic to

$$\{ v \in L^{1,p}(S, E) : D_{u,J}v \in du(C_{(0,1)}^{0,\alpha}(S, TS)) \}.$$

Further, due to *Corollary 2.2.3* the group $\mathcal{G}$ acts freely on all the pairs $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{J}_S)$, which are close enough to the given (u, J_S) . So the tangent space to the orbit $\mathcal{G}*(\tilde{u}, \tilde{J}_S) := \{ (h*\tilde{u}, h*\tilde{J}_S) : h \in \mathcal{G} \}$ in the point $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{J}_S)$ is equal to

$$T_{(\tilde{u}, \tilde{J}_S)} \mathcal{G}*(\tilde{u}, \tilde{J}_S) = \{ (d\tilde{u}(\xi), -2\tilde{J}_S \cdot \xi) \in L^{1,p}(S, \tilde{E}) \times C_{(0,1)}^{0,\alpha}(S, TS) : \xi \in C_{(0,1)}^{0,\alpha}(S, TS) \}.$$

Here we use the relation (2.2.4) and the fact, that for C^1 -curve h_t in $\mathcal{G}$ with $h_0 = \text{Id}$ and $\dot{h}_0 = \xi \in C^{1,\alpha}(S, TS)$ one has

$$\frac{d}{dt}(h_t * J_S) = \nabla \xi \circ J_S - J_S \circ \nabla \xi \equiv -2J_S \bar{\partial}_{J_S} \xi.$$

Consider the quotient spaces

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1 &:= \{ v \in L^{1,p}(S, E) : D_{u,J}v \in du(C_{(0,1)}^{0,\alpha}(S, TS)) \} / du(C^{1,\alpha}(S, TS)), \\ Z_2 &:= \{ v \in L^{1,p}(S, E) : D_{u,J}v \in du(L_{(0,1)}^p(S, TS)) \} / du(L^{1,p}(S, TS)), \end{aligned}$$

with the natural map $\iota Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$. Using methods, similar to ones from the proof of *Theorem 2*, one can show that ι is an isomorphism. So every complementing space Z to $T_{(u, J_S)} \mathcal{G}*(u, J_S)$ in $T_{(u, J_S)} \mathcal{P}_J$ is finite-dimensional, closed, and isomorphic to $H_D^0(S, N_0) \oplus H^0(S, \mathcal{N}_1)$. One can define a chart on $\mathcal{M}_{[\gamma], g, J}$, taking an appropriate submanifold $U \subset \mathcal{P}_J$ with $(u, J_S) \in U$ and $T_{(u, J_S)} U$ complementing to $T_{(u, J_S)} \mathcal{G}*(u, J_S)$, and considering the restriction of the projection $\mathcal{P}_J \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{[\gamma], g, J}$.

q.e.d.

3. Nodes of pseudo-holomorphic curves.

3.1. Unique continuation lemma.

We start with the following unique continuation-type lemma (compare with [Ar] and [Hr-W]):

Lemma 3.1.1. *Suppose that the function $f \in L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$ is not identically 0, $\bar{\partial}f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$ and satisfies a.e. the inequality*

$$|\bar{\partial}f| \leq h \cdot |f| \quad (3.1.1)$$

for some nonnegative $h \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$ with $2 < p < \infty$. Then

- i) $f \in L^{1,p}_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$, in particular $f \in C^{0,\alpha}_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$ with $\alpha := 1 - \frac{2}{p}$;
- ii) for any $z_0 \in \Delta$ such that $f(z_0) = 0$ there exists $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ —the multiplicity of zero of f in z_0 —such that $f(z) = (z - z_0)^\mu \cdot g(z)$ for some $g \in L^{1,p}_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$ with $g(z_0) \neq 0$.

Proof. i) is easily obtained by increasing smoothness argument, see e.g. [Mo]. Really, from (3.1.1) and Hölder inequality one gets that $\bar{\partial}f \in L^{\frac{2p}{p+2}}_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$. Consequently $f \in L^{1, \frac{2p}{p+2}}_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$ due to ellipticity of $\bar{\partial}$ and since $\frac{2p}{p+2} > 1$. Again by Sobolev imbedding we have $f \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$. Suppose now that $f \in L^q_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$ with some $q > 2$. If $\frac{pq}{p+q} < 2$, then $f \in L^{\tilde{q}}_{\text{loc}}$ with $\tilde{q} = 1/(\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}) > q$ by the Sobolev imbedding theorem. Repeating this argument several times we obtain that $f \in L^{1, \tilde{q}}_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$ for some $\tilde{q} > 2$ which implies that f is continuous. Again by (3.1.1) $\bar{\partial}f \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$ and $f \in L^{1,p}_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$. Another application of the Sobolev imbedding theorem, this time for $2 < p < \infty$, yields Hölder α -continuity.

ii) Now suppose that $f(z_0) = 0$. Then due to the Hölder continuity we have $|f(z)| \leq C|z - z_0|^\alpha$ for z close enough to z_0 and consequently $f_1(z) := f(z)/(z - z_0)$ is from $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$. The theorem of Harvey-Polking [Hv-Po] provides that $\bar{\partial}f_1 \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$ and f_1 also satisfies inequality (3.1.1). In particular, f_1 is also continuous. Iteration of this procedure gives a possibility to define the multiplicity of zero of f in z_0 provided we show that after finite number of steps we obtain the function f_N with $f_N(z_0) \neq 0$. To do this we may assume that $z_0 = 0$. Let $\pi_\tau(z) := \tau \cdot z$ for $0 < \tau < 1$. Then $f_\tau := \pi_\tau^*(f)$ satisfies inequality $|\bar{\partial}f_\tau| \leq \tau \pi_\tau^* h \cdot |f_\tau|$. Since

$$\|\tau \pi_\tau^* h\|_{L^p(\Delta)} = \tau^{1-2/p} \cdot \|h\|_{L^p(\pi_\tau(\Delta))}$$

we can also assume that $\|h\|_{L^p(\Delta)}$ is small enough. Fix a cut-off function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Delta)$ which is identically 1 in $\frac{1}{2}\Delta$, the disk of radius $\frac{1}{2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi f\|_{L^p(\Delta)} &\leq C_1 \cdot \|\varphi f\|_{L^{1, \frac{2p}{2+p}}(\Delta)} \leq C_2 \cdot \|\bar{\partial}(\varphi f)\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{2+p}}(\Delta)} \leq \\ &\leq C_2 \cdot (\|\varphi \bar{\partial}f\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{2+p}}(\Delta)} + \|\bar{\partial}\varphi f\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{2+p}}(\Delta)}) \leq C_2 \cdot (\|\varphi h f\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{2+p}}(\Delta)} + \|\bar{\partial}\varphi f\|_{L^{\frac{2p}{2+p}}(\Delta)}) \leq \\ &\leq C_3 (\|\varphi f\|_{L^p(\Delta)} \cdot \|h\|_{L^p(\Delta)} + \|f\|_{L^p(\Delta \setminus \frac{1}{2}\Delta)} \cdot \|\bar{\partial}\varphi\|_{L^2(\Delta \setminus \frac{1}{2}\Delta)}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that the support of $\bar{\partial}\varphi$ lies in $\Delta \setminus \frac{1}{2}\Delta$. Since $\|h\|_{L^p(\Delta)}$ is small enough we obtain the estimate

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\frac{1}{3}\Delta)} \leq C \cdot \|f\|_{L^p(\Delta \setminus \frac{1}{2}\Delta)}$$

with the constant C independent of f . Thus if the multiplicity of zero of f in $z_0 = 0$ is at least μ , then

$$\|z^{-\mu}f\|_{L^p(\frac{1}{3}\Delta)} \leq C \cdot \|z^{-\mu}f\|_{L^p(\Delta \setminus \frac{1}{2}\Delta)}$$

which easily gives

$$\|f\|_{L^p(\frac{1}{3}\Delta)} \leq C \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{-\mu} \cdot \|f\|_{L^p(\Delta \setminus \frac{1}{2}\Delta)}.$$

Now one can easily see that either f has isolated zeros of finite multiplicity, or f is identically zero. Yet the last case is excluded by hypothesis of the lemma.

q.e.d.

Lemma 3.1.2. *Under the hypothesis of Lemma 3.1.1 suppose additionally that f satisfies a.e. the inequality*

$$|\bar{\partial}f(z)| \leq |z - z_0|^\nu h(z) \cdot |f(z)|, \quad (3.1.2)$$

with $z_0 \in \Delta$, $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, and $h \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\Delta)$, $2 < p < \infty$. Then

$$f(z) = (z - z_0)^\mu (P^{(\nu)}(z) + (z - z_0)^\nu g(z)), \quad (3.1.3)$$

where $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ is the multiplicity of f in z_0 , defined above, $P^{(\nu)}$ is a polynomial in z of degree $\leq \nu$ with $P^{(\nu)}(z_0) \neq 0$, $g \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n) \hookrightarrow C^{0,\alpha}$, $\alpha = 1 - \frac{2}{p}$, and $g(z) = O(|z - z_0|^\alpha)$.

Proof uses the same idea as in the previous lemma. Define $f_0(z) := \frac{f(z)}{(z - z_0)^\mu}$ and $h_1(z) := h(z) \cdot |f_0(z)|$. Due to Lemma 3.1.1, $f_0 \in C^{0,\alpha}$, $f_0(z_0) \neq 0$, $h_1 \in L^p_{\text{loc}}$, and f_0 satisfies a.e. the inequality $|\bar{\partial}f_0(z)| \leq |z - z_0|^\nu h_1(z)$.

Set $a_0 = f_0(z_0)$. Since $f_0(z) - a_0 = O(|z - z_0|^\alpha)$, we have $f_1 := \frac{f_0(z) - a_0}{z - z_0} \in L^2_{\text{loc}}$.

Applying the theorem of Harvey-Polking once more we obtain that $|\bar{\partial}f_1| \leq |z - z_0|^{\nu-1} h_1$, and consequently $f_1 \in C^{0,\alpha}$, $f_1(z) - f_1(z_0) = O(|z - z_0|^\alpha)$. Repeating this procedure ν times we obtain the polynomial

$$P^{(\nu)}(z) = a_0 + (z - z_0)a_1 + \cdots + (z - z_0)^\nu a_\nu$$

with

$$a_k := \lim_{z \rightarrow z_0} \frac{f(z) - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (z - z_0)^i a_i}{(z - z_0)^k}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq \nu,$$

and the function

$$g(z) := \frac{f(z) - P^{(\nu)}(z)}{(z - z_0)^\nu},$$

which satisfies the conclusion of the lemma.

q.e.d.

Corollary 3.1.3. *Let J be a Lipschitz-continuous almost complex structure in a neighbourhood U of $0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$, such that $J(0) = J_{\text{st}}$, the standard complex structure in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Suppose that $u : \Delta \rightarrow U$ is a J -holomorphic C^1 -map with $u(0) = 0$. Then there exist*

uniquely defined $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ and a (holomorphic) polynomial $P^{(\mu-1)}$ of degree $\leq \mu-1$, such that $u(z) = z^\mu \cdot P^{(\mu-1)} + z^{2\mu-1}v(z)$ with $v(0) = 0$ and $v \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$ for any $p < \infty$.

Proof. Really, by the hypothesis of the lemma $du + J(u) \circ du \circ J_\Delta = 0$ and hence

$$|\bar{\partial}u| = \left| \frac{1}{2}(du + J_{\text{st}} \circ du \circ J_\Delta) \right| = \left| \frac{1}{2}(J_{\text{st}} - J(u)) \circ du \circ J_\Delta \right| \leq \|J\|_{C^{0,1}(B)} \cdot |u| \cdot |du|. \quad (3.1.4)$$

Thus by Lemma 3.1.1 $u(z) = z^\mu w(z)$ with some $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w \in L_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$ for any $p < \infty$. If $\mu = 1$ we are done. Otherwise $du(z)/z^{\mu-1} = \mu w dz + z dw \in L_{\text{loc}}^p(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$ for any $p < \infty$. So the corollary follows now from Lemma 3.1.2.

q.e.d.

Corollary 3.1.4. *Let $u : S \rightarrow (X, J)$ be a J -holomorphic map. Then for any $p \in X$ the set $u^{-1}(p)$ is discrete in S , provided that J is Lipschitz-continuous.*

Proof. Take an integrable complex structure J_1 in some neighbourhood U of $p \in X$, such that $J(p) = J_1(p)$. Take also J_1 -holomorphic coordinates $w_1, \dots, w_n$ in U , such that $w_i(p) = 0$. Then the statement follows easily from Corollary 3.1.3.

q.e.d.

3.2. Inversion of $\bar{\partial}_J + R$.

Now suppose that $J \in C^0(\Delta, \text{End}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}^{2n}))$ satisfies the identity $J^2 \equiv -1$, i.e. J is a continuous almost complex structure in the trivial $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ -bundle over Δ . Define the $\mathbb{R}$ -linear differential first order operator $\bar{\partial}_J : L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{R}^{2n}) \rightarrow L^p(\Delta, \mathbb{R}^{2n})$ by setting

$$\bar{\partial}_J(f) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} + J \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right). \quad (3.2.1)$$

For example, for $J \equiv J_{\text{st}}$, the standard complex structure in $\mathbb{R}^{2n} = \mathbb{C}^n$, the operator $\bar{\partial}_J$ is usual Cauchy-Riemann operator $\bar{\partial}$. The operator $\bar{\partial}_J$ is elliptic and possesses nice regularity properties in Sobolev spaces $L^{k,p}$ with $1 < p < \infty$ and Hölder spaces $C^{k,\alpha}$ with $0 < \alpha < 1$. The following two statements are typical for (nonlinear) elliptic PDE and gathers result which we need for purpose of this paper.

Lemma 3.2.1. *Let J be C^k -continuous with $k \geq 0$ and $\bar{\partial}_J$ be as above. Let also R be an $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ -valued function in Δ of class $L^{k,p}$ with $1 < p < \infty$. If $k = 0$ we also assume that $p > 2$. Suppose that for $\bar{\partial}_J f + Rf \in L^{k,p}$ for some $f \in L^{1,1}(\Delta, \mathbb{R}^{2n})$. Then $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^{k+1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and for $r < 1$*

$$i) \quad \|f\|_{L^{k+1,p}(\Delta(r))} \leq C_1(J, \|R\|_{L^{k,p}}, k, p, r) (\|\bar{\partial}_J f + Rf\|_{L^{k,p}(\Delta)} + \|f\|_{L^1(\Delta)})$$

If, in addition, J and R are $C^{k,\alpha}$ -smooth with $0 < \alpha < 1$, then $f \in C_{\text{loc}}^{k+1,\alpha}(\Delta, \mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and

$$ii) \quad \|f\|_{C^{k+1,\alpha}(\Delta(r))} \leq C_2(J, \|R\|_{C^{k,\alpha}}, k, \alpha, r) \cdot (\|\bar{\partial}_J f + Rf\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(\Delta)} + \|f\|_{L^1(\Delta)})$$

If additionally $\|J - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^k(\Delta)} + \|R\|_{L^{k,p}(\Delta)}$ (resp. $\|J - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(\Delta)} + \|R\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(\Delta)}$) is small enough, then there exists a linear bounded operator $T_{J,R} : L^{k,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{R}^{2n}) \rightarrow L^{k+1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{R}^{2n})$ (resp. $T_{J,R} : C^{k,\alpha}(\Delta, \mathbb{R}^{2n}) \rightarrow C^{k+1,\alpha}(\Delta, \mathbb{R}^{2n})$), such that $(\bar{\partial}_J + R) \circ T_{J,R} \equiv \text{Id}$ and $T_{J,R}(f)|_{z=0} = 0$.

Proof. The estimates i) and ii) of the theorem are obtained from the ellipticity of $\bar{\partial}_J$ by standard methods, see [Mo] for the case of general elliptic systems or [Sk] for the direct proof. We note only that for J being only continuous the constant C_1 in i) crucially depends on modulus of continuity of J , whereas in all the other cases of the theorem the dependence is essentially only on the corresponding norm of J .

Let T be a composition $\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \circ G$ where $G(f)$ is the solution of the Poisson equation $\Delta u = f$ with the Dirichlet boundary condition on $\partial\Delta$. Then for $J \equiv J_{\text{st}}$ and $R \equiv 0$ we can define $T_{J_{\text{st}},0}(f) := T(f) - T(f)(0)$. In general case we set

$$T_{J,R} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n T_{J_{\text{st}},0} \circ ((\bar{\partial}_J - \bar{\partial}_{J_{\text{st}}} + R) \circ T_{J_{\text{st}},0})^n.$$

Due to the Sobolev imbedding theorem, the series converges in an appropriated norm provided $\|J - J_{\text{st}}\| + \|R\|$ is small enough.

q.e.d.

Corollary 3.2.2. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $q > 2$, and J a C^k -smooth almost complex structure in X . Let also (S, J_S) be a complex curve. Suppose that $L^{1,q}$ -map $u : S \rightarrow X$ satisfies the equation

$$du + J \circ du \circ J_S = 0.$$

Then u is $L^{k+1,p}$ -smooth for any $p < \infty$. If, in addition, J is $C^{k,\alpha}$ -smooth with $0 < \alpha < 1$, then u is $C^{k+1,\alpha}$ -smooth.

Let $J^{(n)}$ (resp. $J_S^{(n)}$) be a sequence of almost complex structures on X (resp. on S), which C^k -converges to J (resp. to $J_S^{(n)}$) and let $u_n : S \rightarrow X$ be a sequence of $(J_S^{(n)}, J^{(n)})$ -holomorphic maps. Then the C^0 -convergence $u_n \rightarrow u$ implies the $L^{k+1,p}$ -convergence for any $p < \infty$, and $C^{k+1,\alpha}$ -convergence if $(J_S^{(n)}, J^{(n)})$ converge to (J_S, J) in $C^{k,\alpha}$, $0 < \alpha < 1$.

Proof. The map u is continuous and in local coordinates $w_1, \dots, w_{2n}$ on X and $z = x + iy$ on S the equation has the form

$$du(z) + J(u(z)) \circ du \circ J_M = 0,$$

which is equivalent to $\bar{\partial}_{J \circ u} u = 0$. Using Lemma 3.2.1 and induction in $k' = 0 \dots k$, one can obtain the regularity of u .

Similarly, for $J^{(n)}$ and $u^{(n)}$ satisfying the hypothesis of the corollary one gets

$$\bar{\partial}_{J \circ u}(u^{(n)} - u) = (\bar{\partial}_{J \circ u} - \bar{\partial}_{J^{(n)} \circ u^{(n)}})u^{(n)} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^{k', p} \text{ (resp. in } C_{\text{loc}}^{k', \alpha}),$$

by induction in $k' = 0 \dots k$.

q.e.d.

Remark. The corollary implies that for a compact Riemannian surface S the topology in the space $\mathcal{P}$ of (J_S, J) -holomorphic maps $u : S \rightarrow X$ is independent of the particular choice of the functional space $L^{k', p}(S, X) \supset \mathcal{P}$ with $1 \leq k' \leq k+1$, $1 < p < \infty$, and $kp > 2$, provided J_S and J are changing C^k -smoothly. In the same way, *Lemma 3.2.1* implies that for $J \in C^k$ with $k \geq 1$ the differential structure on $\mathcal{P}$ is also independent of the particular choice of a functional space $L^{k', p}(S, X)$ with $1 \leq k' \leq k$, $1 < p < \infty$ and $k'p > 2$.

Lemma 3.2.3. *For any natural numbers $\mu > \nu \geq 0$ and real numbers $p > 2$, $\alpha < \frac{2}{p}$ and $\gamma > 0$ there exists $C = C(\mu, \nu, \alpha, p, \gamma) > 0$ with the following property. Let J be an almost complex structure in $B \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ with $J(0) = J_{\text{st}}$ and let $u : \Delta \rightarrow B$ be a J -holomorphic map of the form $u(z) = z^\mu(P(z) + z^\nu v(z))$, where $P(z)$ is some (holomorphic) polynomial of the degree ν and $v \in L^{1, p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$ with $v(0) = 0$. Suppose that $\|J - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} \leq \gamma$ and $\|u\|_{L^{1, p}(\Delta)} \leq \gamma$. Then for any $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$*

$$\|zdv\|_{C^0(\Delta(r))} + \|zdv\|_{L^{1, p}(\Delta(r))} \leq C \cdot r^\alpha \cdot \|u\|_{L^{1, p}(\Delta)}, \quad (3.2.2)$$

In particular, $du(z) = d(z^\mu P(z)) + o(|z|^{\mu+\nu-1+\alpha})$ for any $\alpha < 1$.

Proof. For $0 < r < \frac{3}{4}$ we define the map $\pi_r : B \rightarrow B$, setting $\pi_r(w) := r^\mu w$. We also set $J^{(r)} := \pi_r^* J$, $u^{(r)}(z) := \pi_r^{-1} \circ u(rz)$, $P^{(r)}(z) := P(rz)$ and $v^{(r)}(z) = r^\nu v(rz)$. Then $J^{(r)}$ is an almost complex structures in B with $\|J^{(r)} - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} \leq r^\mu \|J - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)}$, and $u^{(r)} \equiv z^\mu(P^{(r)}(z) + z^\nu v^{(r)}(z))$ is a $J^{(r)}$ -holomorphic.

Without losing generality we can suppose that $\alpha > 0$. Set $\beta := 1 + \alpha - \frac{2}{p}$ and $q := \frac{2}{1-\beta}$. Then $\alpha < \beta < 1$, $\beta + \frac{2}{p} - 1 = \alpha$, and $q > 2$. The *Lemma 3.1.3* implies that $\|v\|_{C^{0, \beta}(\Delta(2/3))} + \|dv\|_{L^q(\Delta(2/3))} \leq C_1 \cdot \|u\|_{L^{1, p}(\Delta)}$. Here the constant C_1 , as also constants $C_2, \dots, C_6$ below, depend only on μ, ν, p, α , and γ , but are independent of r . Consequently,

$$\|u^{(r)} - z^\mu P^{(r)}(z)\|_{L^{1, q}(\Delta)} \leq C_2 \cdot r^{\nu+\beta} \cdot \|u\|_{L^{1, p}(\Delta)}.$$

Further, due to the *Corollary 3.2.2* we have $\|u^{(r)}\|_{L^{2, p}(\Delta)} \leq C_3 \cdot \|u\|_{L^{1, p}(\Delta)}$. Thus

$$\|\bar{\partial}_{J_{\text{st}}}(u^{(r)} - z^\mu P^{(r)}(z))\|_{L^{1, p}(\Delta)} = \|(\bar{\partial}_{J_{\text{st}}} - \bar{\partial}_{J^{(r)} \circ u^{(r)}})(u^{(r)})\|_{L^{1, p}(\Delta)} \leq C_4 \cdot r^\mu \cdot \|u\|_{L^{1, p}(\Delta)}.$$

Applying *Lemma 3.2.1* we obtain

$$\|zdv^{(r)}\|_{L^{1, p}(\Delta(2/3))} \leq C_5 \cdot r^{\nu+\beta} \cdot \|u\|_{L^{1, p}(\Delta)}, \quad (3.2.3)$$

which is equivalent to

$$\|zdv\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta(2r/3))} \leq C_5 \cdot r^{\beta+2/p-1} \cdot \|u\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)}.$$

On the other hand, (3.2.3) implies that

$$\|zdv^{(r)}\|_{C^0(\Delta(2/3))} \leq C_6 \cdot r^{\nu+\beta} \cdot \|u\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)},$$

and consequently

$$\|zdv\|_{C^0(\Delta(2r/3))} \leq C_6 \cdot r^\beta \cdot \|u\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)}.$$

q.e.d.

Lemma 3.2.4. *For given p , $2 < p < \infty$, and $\gamma > 0$ there exist constants $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(p, \gamma)$ and $C = C(p, \gamma)$ with the following property. Suppose that J is a C^1 -smooth almost complex structure in the unit ball $B \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\|J - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} \leq \varepsilon$ and $u \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, B(0, \frac{1}{2}))$ is a J -holomorphic map with $\|u\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} \leq \gamma$. Then for every almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$ in B with $\|\tilde{J} - J\|_{C^1(B)} \leq \varepsilon$ there exists a $\tilde{J}$ -holomorphic map $\tilde{u} : \Delta \rightarrow B$ with*

$$\|\tilde{u} - u\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} \leq C \cdot \|\tilde{J} - J\|_{C^1(B)},$$

such that $\tilde{u}(0) = u(0)$.

Proof. Let J_t be a curve of C^1 -smooth almost complex structures in B , starting at $J_0 = J$ and depending C^1 -smoothly in $t \in [0, 1]$. Consider an ordinary differential equation for $u_t \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, B)$ with initial condition $u_0 = u$ and

$$\frac{du_t}{dt} = -T_{J_t \circ u_t, R_t} \left(\frac{dJ}{dt} \circ du_t \circ J_\Delta \right), \quad (3.2.4)$$

where R_t is defined by relation $D_{J_t, u_t} = \bar{\partial}_{J_t, u_t} + R_t$, see paragraph 2.2. Since J_0 and R_0 satisfy the hypothesis of the Lemma 3.2.1 and R_t depends L^p -continuously on $J_t \in C^1$ and $u_t \in L^{1,p}$, the solution exists in some small interval $0 \leq t \leq t_0$. For such solution using (2.2.1) one has

$$\left\| \frac{du_t}{dt} \right\|_{L^{1,p}} + \left\| \frac{dR_t}{dt} \right\|_{L^p} \leq C \cdot (\|u_t\|_{L^{1,p}} + \|J_t - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1}) \cdot \left\| \frac{dJ_t}{dt} \right\|_{C^1}.$$

This implies the existence of the solution of (3.2.2) for all $t \in [0, 1]$, provided

$$\int_{t=0}^1 \left\| \frac{dJ_t}{dt} \right\|_{C^1} dt \leq \varepsilon.$$

q.e.d.

3.3. Perturbing cusps of pseudo-holomorphic curves.

In this paragraph we suppose that some p with $2 < p < \infty$ is fixed.

Lemma 3.3.1. *For every $\gamma > 0$ and every pair of integers $\nu \geq 1$, $\mu \geq 1$ there exists an $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\mu, \nu, \gamma) > 0$ such that for an almost complex structure J_0 in B with $\|J_0 - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} \leq \varepsilon$, $J_0(0) = J_{\text{st}}$, and for a J_0 -holomorphic map $u_0 : \Delta \rightarrow B(0, \frac{1}{2})$ with $\|u_0\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} \leq \gamma$ and with the multiplicity μ at $0 \in \Delta$ the following holds:*

i) *If $\nu \leq 2\mu - 1$ then for every almost complex structure J in B with $J(0) = J_{\text{st}}$ and for every $v \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$ with $\|v\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} + \|J - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(\Delta)} \leq \varepsilon$ there exists $w \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$ with $w(0) = 0$, satisfying*

$$\bar{\partial}_J(u_0 + z^\nu(v + w)) = 0 \quad (3.3.1)$$

and

$$\|w\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} \leq C \cdot (\|v\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} + \|J - J_0\|_{C^1(\Delta)}). \quad (3.3.2)$$

ii) *If $\nu \geq 2\mu$ then for every $v \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$ with $\|v\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} \leq \varepsilon$ there exists $w \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$ with $w(0) = 0$, satisfying*

$$\bar{\partial}_{J_0}(u_0 + z^\nu(v + w)) = 0 \quad (3.3.3)$$

and

$$\|w\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} \leq C \cdot \|v\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)}. \quad (3.3.4)$$

Proof. If $\nu \leq 2\mu - 1$, we fix a curve J_t , $t \in [0, 1]$, of C^1 -smooth almost complex structures in B , which starts in J_0 , finishes in J and satisfies the conditions $J_t(0) = J_{\text{st}}$ and $\int_{t=0}^1 \|\dot{J}_t\|_{C^1(B)} dt \leq 2\varepsilon$, where $\dot{J}_t := dJ_t/dt$. If $\nu \geq 2\mu$, we simply set $J_t \equiv J_0$.

As in the previous lemma, we want to find a needed w by solving for $t \in [0, 1]$ and $w_t \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$ the equation

$$z^{-\nu} \bar{\partial}_{J_t}(u_0 + z^\nu(t \cdot v + w_t)) = 0.$$

However, this time we need to take into consideration the fact that now we deal with different (almost) complex structures on B , namely J_{st} and J_t for any fixed $t \in [0, 1]$. So we write the last equation in the more correct form:

$$(x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{-\nu} \bar{\partial}_{J_t}(u_0 + (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^\nu(t \cdot v + w_t)) = 0. \quad (3.3.5)$$

The differentiation of (3.3.5) with respect to t gives

$$(x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{-\nu} D_{u_t, J_t}((x + yJ_{\text{st}})^\nu(v + \dot{w}_t)) + (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{-\nu} \dot{J}_t \circ du_t \circ J_\Delta = 0, \quad (3.3.6)$$

where $u_t := u_0 + (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^\nu(t \cdot v + w_t)$ and J_{st} denotes also the pull-back of the standard complex structure on $E := u_t^*TB \cong \mathbb{C}^n$.

Firsts we show that the operator $(x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{-\nu} \circ D_{u_t, J_t} \circ (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^\nu$ has the form $\bar{\partial}_{J_t^{(\nu)}} + R_t^{(\nu)}$ for appropriate (almost) complex structure $\bar{\partial}_{J_t^{(\nu)}}$ in $E \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbb{R}$ -linear operator

$R_t^{(\nu)}$. Really, the explicit formula (2.1.6) for $D_{u,J}$ shows that taking the standard connection ∇ in $TB \cong \mathbb{C}^n$ and identifying $\Lambda^{(0,1)}\Delta \cong \mathbb{C}$ one gets

$$D_{u_t, J_t}(v) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} v + J_t \frac{\partial}{\partial x} v \right) + R_t^{(0)}(v)$$

with $R_t^{(0)} \in C^0(\Delta, \text{End}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{C}^n))$. More over, the formula (2.2.1) implies that

$$\|R_t^{(0)}\|_{L^p(\Delta)} \leq \|J_t\|_{C^1(B)} \cdot \|du_t\|_{L^p(\Delta)}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 2(x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{-\nu} \circ D_{u_t, J_t} \circ (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{\nu} &= \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{-\nu} \circ J_t \circ (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right] + \\ &+ \left[\nu \cdot (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{-\nu} \circ (1 + J_t \circ J_{\text{st}}) \circ (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{\nu-1} + 2(x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{-\nu} \circ R_t^{(0)} \circ (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{\nu} \right] = \\ &= 2\bar{\partial}_{J_t^{(\nu)}} + 2R_t^{(\nu)}. \end{aligned}$$

One has the obvious identities $(J_t^{(\nu)})^2 \equiv -1$,

$$\|J_t^{(\nu)} - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^0(\Delta)} = \|(x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{-\nu} \circ (J_t - J_{\text{st}}) \circ (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{\nu}\|_{C^0(\Delta)} = \|J_t - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^0(B)},$$

and

$$\|(x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{-\nu} \circ R_t^{(0)} \circ (x + yJ_{\text{st}})^{\nu}\|_{L^p(\Delta)} = \|R_t^{(0)}\|_{L^p(\Delta)}.$$

Further, $1 + J_t(0)J_{\text{st}} = 0$ and hence $\| |z|^{-1}(1 + J_t J_{\text{st}})\|_{C^0(\Delta)} \leq \|J_t - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)}$. This gives the estimate

$$\|R_t^{(\nu)}\|_{L^p(\Delta)} \leq (C_1 \cdot \nu + C_2 \cdot \|du_t\|_{L^p(\Delta)}) \cdot \|J_t - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)}.$$

To show the existence of the solution of (3.3.5) for all $t \in [0, 1]$ we need the estimate

$$\left\| z^{-\nu} \cdot \dot{J}_t(u_0 + z^{\nu}w) \circ d(u_0 + z^{\nu}w) \right\|_{L^p(\Delta)} \leq C_1(\mu, \nu) \cdot \|u_0\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)}^2 \cdot \|\dot{J}_t\|_{C^1(B)} \quad (3.3.7)$$

for all sufficiently small $w \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$. The estimate trivially holds for $\nu \geq 2\mu$, since in this case $\dot{J}_t \equiv 0$. Otherwise for $\lambda := \min\{\mu, \nu\}$ from *Corollary 3.1.3*. one gets

$$\|z^{-\lambda}(u_0 + z^{\nu}w)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Delta)} + \|z^{-\lambda+1}d(u_0 + z^{\nu}w)\|_{L^p(\Delta)} \leq C_2(\mu, \nu) \cdot \|u_0\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} \quad (3.3.8)$$

which gives the estimate (3.3.7).

Now consider the ordinary differential equation for $w_t \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, B)$ with initial condition $w_0 \equiv 0$ and

$$\frac{dw_t}{dt} = -T_{J_t^{(\nu)}, R_t^{(\nu)}} \left(z^{-\nu} \cdot \dot{J}_t \circ du_t \circ J_{\Delta} + v \right). \quad (3.3.9)$$

As in Lemma 3.2.4 one has the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{dw_t}{dt} \right\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} + \left\| \frac{dR_t^{(\nu)}}{dt} \right\|_{L^p(\Delta)} \leq \\ & \leq C \cdot (\|u_t\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} + \|J_t - J_{st}\|_{C^1(B)}) \cdot \left(\left\| \frac{dJ_t}{dt} \right\|_{C^1(B)} + \|v\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies the existence of the solution of (3.3.9) for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

q.e.d.

3.4. Positivity of intersections.

Let us recall the notion of intersection number of two surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^4$. So, let M_1 and M_2 be two-dimensional oriented surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^4$ passing through the origin, i.e. M_i is C^1 -image of some two-dimensional oriented surface S_i , $i = 1, 2$. Further we suppose that both M_1, M_2 intersect the unit sphere S^3 transversally by curves γ_1 and γ_2 respectively and that γ_1 and γ_2 does not meet each other. Let $\widetilde{M}_i$ are small perturbations of M_i making them intersect transversally.

Definition 3.4.1. The *intersection number* of M_1 and M_2 is defined to be the algebraic intersection number of $\widetilde{M}_1$ with $\widetilde{M}_2$. If M_1, M_2 intersect only at zero and both intersect every sphere S_r^3 , $0 < r < 1$ transversally, we shall also say that number just defined is the *intersection index* of M_1 and M_2 at zero. It will be denoted by $\delta_0(M_1, M_2)$ or δ_0 .

Remark. This number is independent of the particular choice of perturbations $\widetilde{M}_1$ and $\widetilde{M}_2$. Later we shall use the fact that the intersection number of M_1 and M_2 is equal to the *linking number* $l(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ of the reducible curves γ_1 and γ_2 on S^3 , see [Rf].

Theorem 3.4.1. Let $u_i : \Delta \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^4, J)$, $i = 1, 2$ be two primitive nonconstant J -holomorphic disks such that $u_1(\Delta) = M_1 \neq M_2 = u_2(\Delta)$ and $u_1(0) = u_2(0)$. Let $Q = M_1 \cap M_2$ be the set of intersection of those disks. If J is C^1 -smooth, then:

- i) $u_i^{-1}(Q)$ is a discrete subset of Δ for $i = 1, 2$.
- ii) The intersection index in any such point of Q is strictly positive. More over, if μ_1 and μ_2 are the multiplicities of u_1 and u_2 in z_1 and z_2 respectively, with $u_1(z_1) = u_2(z_2) = p$, then the intersection number δ_p of M_1 and M_2 at p is at least $\mu_1 \cdot \mu_2$.
- iii) $\delta_p = 1$ iff M_1 and M_2 intersect at p transversally.

Proof. First we consider the case when $u_1 : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ is an imbedding. Let N be the normal bundle to $u_1(\Delta)$. Fix a Hermitian metric h on X and consider the map

$$f : \xi \in N_z \mapsto \exp_{u_1(z)}(\xi) \in X,$$

where $\exp_p$ denote the usual h -exponential map. Then f is a diffeomorphism of some neighbourhood of zero-section of N onto a neighbourhood V of $u_1(\Delta)$ in X . Since N admits a holomorphic structure, in the set V there exist an *integrable* complex structure J_1 and J_1 -holomorphic coordinates w_1 and w_2 , such that $J = J_1$ on $u_1(\Delta)$ and the map u_1 has the form $(z, 0)$ in coordinates $\{w_i\}$. In particular,

$$|J(w_1, w_2) - J_1(w_1, w_2)| \leq C|w_2|. \quad (3.4.1)$$

Consider now $u_2 : \Delta \rightarrow V$ our second J -holomorphic map. We have that $u_2(0) = u_1(0) = (0,0) =: p$ and $u_2(\Delta) \not\subset u_1(\Delta)$. Then due to *Corollary 3.1.3* in the coordinates $\{w_1, w_2\}$ the map u_2 has the form $(w_1(z), w_2(z)) = (z^\mu a(z), z^\mu b(z))$ with $a, b \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C})$, $(a(0), b(0)) \neq 0$ and $\mu > 0$. On the other hand, the condition (3.4.1) implies that the second coordinate of u_2 satisfies the inequality $|\bar{\partial} w_2(z)| \leq C \cdot |w_2(z)|$, and consequently $w_2(z) = z^\nu b'(z)$ with $b' \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C})$, $b'(0) \neq 0$ and $\nu > 0$. One can see that the only two following cases are possible.

Case 1. $b(0) \neq 0$, so the vector $(a(0), b(0))$ is transversal to $u_1(\Delta) \subset \{w_2 = 0\}$, and $\mu = \nu$. In this case the intersection number of $u_1(\Delta)$ and $u_2(\Delta)$ in the point p equals exactly μ .

Case 2. $b(0) = 0$ and $\nu > \mu$. In this case the map u_2 has the form $(z^\mu \cdot a(z), z^\nu \cdot b'(z))$, so the intersection number is equal to ν .

Now one can conclude that $u_2^{-1}(u(\Delta))$ is discrete in Δ and the intersection index of $u_1(\Delta)$ and $u_2(\Delta)$ in any common point $p \in u_1(\Delta) \cap u_2(\Delta)$ is positive and not less than the multiplicity of u_2 in p . One also concludes that, under the hypothesis of the theorem, there exists at most countable set of intersection points of M_1 and M_2 , and that the limit points of $M_1 \cap M_2$ are cuspidal for both M_1 and M_2 .

Let us consider the situation when both curves M_1 and M_2 have a cusp in a point $p \in Q$ with multiplicities μ_1 and μ_2 respectively. Since the problem is essentially local we can assume that u_1 and u_2 are proper maps from Δ into the unit ball $B \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, which are holomorphic with respect to the almost complex structure J . We can also assume that $0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$ is a cuspidal point for both u_1 and u_2 , and that $J(0) = J_{\text{st}}$.

Let the map $\pi_t : B \rightarrow B$ be defined by formula $\pi_t(w) := t \cdot w$. The direct calculation shows that $\|\pi_t^* J - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} \leq C \cdot t$. Thus considering $\pi_t^* J$ instead of J and $\pi_t^{-1} \circ u_j(r^{\mu_j} z)$ instead $u_j(z)$, with t small enough, we can assume that

$$\|J_{\text{st}} - J\|_{C^1(B)} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_j\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} \leq \gamma,$$

for any given $\varepsilon > 0$. Further, we can also assume that B contains no other cuspidal points of M_1 or M_2 , and that ∂B contains no intersection points. Note, that we can also fix r^- with $r > r^- > 0$, such that there are no intersection points in the spherical shell $B \setminus B_{r^-}$.

By *Corollary 3.1.3* the maps u_i can be represented in the form $u_i(z) = z^{\mu_i} \cdot v_i(z)$ with $v_i \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^2)$ such that $v_1(0) \neq 0 \neq v_2(0)$. As above, we consider two cases.

Case 1. The vectors $v_1(0)$ and $v_2(0)$ are not collinear. It is easy to see that in this case $0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$ is an isolated intersection point of $u_1(\Delta)$ and $u_2(\Delta)$ with multiplicity exactly $\mu_1 \cdot \mu_2$.

Case 2. The second case is when the vectors $v_1(0)$ and $v_2(0)$ are collinear. The idea is to “turn” the map u_2 a little and to reduce the case to the previous one. So let $T \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ be a linear unitary map which is close enough to identity, such that $T(v_2(0))$ is not collinear to $v_1(0)$. Define $J^T := T^{-1} \circ J \circ T$ so that $\|J^T - J\|_{C^1(B)} \leq \|T - \text{Id}\|$. Applying *Lemma 3.3.1* with $u_0 = z^{\mu_2} v_2$ and $v = 0$ we can find $w \in L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^2)$ with $w(0) = 0$, such that $\bar{\partial}_{J^T}(z^{\mu_2}(v_2 + w)) = 0$. The map $\tilde{u}_2 := T(z^{\mu_2}(v_2 + w))$ is needed “turned” J -holomorphic map. Since such a “turn” can be done small enough, the intersection number of $u_i(\Delta)$ in the ball B_{r^-} does not change.

This implies, that the intersection number of $u_1(\Delta)$ and $u_2(\Delta)$ in any ball B_r is not less than $\mu_1 \cdot \mu_2$. Another conclusion is that $0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$ is an isolated intersection point of $u_j(\Delta)$. Otherwise we could find a sequence $r_i \searrow 0$ with at least one intersection point of $u_j(\Delta)$ in every spherical shell $B_{r_i} \setminus B_{r_{i+1}}$, and therefore the intersection number of $u_j(\Delta)$ in the balls B_{r_i} would be strictly decreasing in i .

Thus the statements (i) and (ii) are proved. The proof of (iii) is now obvious and follows from the observation that $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 1$ in this case.

q.e.d.

Corollary 3.4.2. *Let $u_i : S_i \rightarrow (X, J)$, $i = 1, 2$ be compact irreducible J -holomorphic curves such that $u_1(S_1) = M_1 \neq u_2(S_2) = M_2$. Then they have finitely many intersection points and the intersection index in any such point is strictly positive. More over, if μ_1 and μ_2 are the multiplicities of u_1 and u_2 in such a point p , then the intersection number of M_1 and M_2 in p is at least $\mu_1 \cdot \mu_2$.*

4. The Bennequin index and the Genus formula for pseudo-holomorphic curves.

4.1. Transversality and the Bennequin Index.

Let $u : (\Delta, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, J, 0)$ be a germ of nonconstant pseudo-holomorphic curve in zero. Without loss of generality we always suppose that $J(0) = J_{\text{st}}$. Taking into account that zeros of du are isolated, we can suppose that du vanishes only at zero. Further, let w_1, w_2 be the standard complex coordinates in $(\mathbb{C}^2, J_{\text{st}})$. According to the *Lemma 3.1.3* we can write our curve in the form

$$u(z) = z^\mu \cdot a + o(|z|^{\mu+\alpha}), \quad a \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}, 0 < \alpha < 1. \quad (4.1.1)$$

For $r > 0$ define $F_r := TS_r^3 \cap J(TS_r^3)$ to be the distribution of J -complex planes in the tangent bundle TS_r^3 to the sphere of radius r . F_r is trivial because J is homotopic to $J_{\text{st}} = J(0)$. By F we denote the distribution $\cup_{r>0} F_r \subset \cup_{r>0} TS_r^3 \subset TB^*$, where TB^* is the tangent bundle to the punctured ball in $\mathbb{C}^2$.

Lemma 4.1.1. *The (possibly reducible) curve $\gamma_r = M \cap S_r^3$ is transversal to F_r for all sufficiently small $r > 0$.*

Proof. Really, due to the *Lemma 3.2.3* one has $du(z) = \mu z^{\mu-1} \cdot a dz + o(|z|^{\mu-1+\alpha})$. Since $J \approx J_{\text{st}}$ for r sufficiently small, $T\gamma_r$ is close to $J_{\text{st}}\mathbf{n}_r$, where $\mathbf{n}_r$ is the field of normal vectors to S_r^3 .

On the other hand, for sufficiently small r the distribution F_r is close to the one of J_{st} complex planes in TS_r^3 , which is orthogonal to $J_{\text{st}}\mathbf{n}_r$.

q.e.d.

This fact permits us to define a Bennequin index of γ_r . Namely, take any nonvanishing section $\vec{v}$ of F_r and move γ_r along vector field v to obtain a curve γ'_r . We can make this move for a small enough time, so that γ'_r does not intersect γ_r . Following Bennequin [Bn], we give

Definition 4.1.1. Define the *Bennequin index* $b(\gamma_r)$ to be a linking number of γ_r and γ'_r .

This number does not depend on $r > 0$, taken sufficiently small, because γ_r is homotopic to γ_{r_1} for $r_1 < r$ within the curves transversal to F , see [Bn]. It is also independent of the particular choice of the field $\vec{v}$. Thus for the standard complex structure J_{st} in $B \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ we use $\vec{v}_{\text{st}}(w_1, w_2) := (-\bar{w}_2, \bar{w}_1)$ for calculating the Bennequin index of the curves on sufficiently small spheres. For an arbitrary almost complex structure J with $J(0) = J_{\text{st}}$ we can find the vector field $\vec{v}_J$, which is defined in a small punctured neighbourhood of $0 \in B$, is a small perturbation of $\vec{v}_{\text{st}}$, and lies in the distribution F defined by J .

Denote by B_{r_1, r_2} the spherical shell $B_{r_2} \setminus B_{r_1}$ for $r_1 < r_2$.

Lemma 4.1.2. *Let Γ be an immersed J -holomorphic curve in the neighbourhood of $\bar{B}_{r_1, r_2}$ such that all self intersection points*

of Γ are contained in B_{r_1, r_2} and for every $r_1 \leq r \leq r_2$ all components of the curve $\gamma_r = \Gamma \cap S_r^3$ are transversal to F_r . Then

$$b(\gamma_{r_2}) = b(\gamma_{r_1}) + 2 \cdot \sum_{x \in \text{Sing}(\Gamma)} \delta_x, \quad (4.1.5)$$

where the sum is taken over self-intersection points of Γ .

Proof. Move a bit Γ along v_J to obtain Γ^ε . By $\gamma_{r_1}^\varepsilon, \gamma_{r_2}^\varepsilon$ denote the intersections $\Gamma^\varepsilon \cap S_{r_1}^3, \Gamma^\varepsilon \cap S_{r_2}^3$, which are of course the moves of γ_{r_j} along v_J . We have that $l(\gamma_{r_2}, \gamma_{r_1}^\varepsilon) - l(\gamma_{r_1}, \gamma_{r_1}^\varepsilon) = \text{int}(\Gamma, \Gamma^\varepsilon)$, here $l(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the linking number and $\text{int}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the intersection number.

Now let us calculate $\text{int}(\Gamma, \Gamma^\varepsilon)$. From *Theorem 3.4.1* we now that there are only finite number $\{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$ of self-intersection points of Γ . Take one of them, say p_1 . Let $M_1, \dots, M_d$ be the disks on Γ with common point p_1 and otherwise mutually disjoint. More precisely we take M_j to be an irreducible components of $\Gamma \cap B_{p_1}(\rho)$ for $\rho > 0$ small enough. Remark that M_j are transversal to v_J , so their moves M_j^ε don't intersect them, i.e. $M_j \cap M_j^\varepsilon = \emptyset$. Note also that $\text{int}(M_k, M_j) = \text{int}(M_k, M_j^\varepsilon)$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. So $\text{int}(M_k, M_j) = \text{int}(M_k, M_j^\varepsilon) + \text{int}(M_k^\varepsilon, M_j)$. Finally $\delta_{p_1} = \sum_{1 \leq k < j \leq d} \text{int}(M_k, M_j) = \text{int}(\Gamma \cap B_{p_1}(\rho), \Gamma^\varepsilon \cap B_{p_1}(\rho))$. This means that $\text{int}(\Gamma, \Gamma^\varepsilon) = 2 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{p_j}$.

q.e.d.

4.2. Proof of the Genus formula and estimate of the Bennequin index from below.

In §3 we have proved that compact J -holomorphic curve with finite number of irreducible components $M = \bigcup_{i=1}^d M_i$ has only finite number of nodes (i.e. self-intersection points) points, provided J is of class C^1 .

For each such point p we can introduce following the *Definition 3.4.1* the self-intersection number $\delta_p(M)$ of M at p . Namely, let S_j be a parameter curve for M_j , i.e. M_j is given as an image of the J -holomorphic map $u_j : S_j \rightarrow M_j$. We always suppose that the parametrization u_j is primitive, i.e. they cannot be decomposed like $u_j = v_j \circ r$ where r is nontrivial covering of S_j by another Riemannian surface. Denote by $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ the set of all preimages of p under $u : \bigsqcup_{i=1}^d S_j \rightarrow X$, and take mutually disjoint disks $\{D_1, \dots, D_N\}$ with centers $x_1, \dots, x_N$ such that their images have no other common points different from p . For each pair D_i, D_j , $i \neq j$, define an intersection number as in *Definition 3.4.1* and take the sum over all different pairs to obtain $\delta_p(M)$.

Put now $\delta = \sum_{p \in D(M)} \delta_p(M)$, here the sum is taken over the set $D(M)$ of all nodes of M , i.e. points which have at least two preimages.

Consider now the set $\{p_1, \dots, p_L\} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^d S_j = S$ of all cusps of M , i.e. points where the differential of the appropriate parametrization vanishes. Take a small ball B_r around say $u(p_i)$ and small disk D_{p_i} around p_i . Let $\gamma_r^i := u(\Delta_{p_i}) \cap \partial B_r$ and b_i be the Bennequin index of γ_r^i , defined in *Definition 4.1.1*.

Definition 4.2.1. The number $\kappa_i := (b_i + 1)/2$ is called the *conductor of the cusp* $a_i = u(p_i)$.

Put also $\kappa := \sum_{i=1}^L \kappa_i$. We are able to state now the Genus formula.

Theorem 3. Let $M = \bigcup_{j=1}^d M_j$ be a compact J -holomorphic curve in almost complex surface (X, J) with the distinct irreducible components $\{M_j\}$, where J is of class $L^{1,p}$. Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^d g_j = \frac{[M]^2 - c_1(X, J)[M]}{2} + d - \delta - \kappa, \quad (4.2.1)$$

where g_j are the genera of parameter curves S_j .

Proof. The main line of the proof is the reduction of a general case to the case when M is immersed, which is already proved in §1.

Let $u : \bigsqcup_{j=1}^d S_j \rightarrow X$ be a J -holomorphic map, which parameterizes the curve M . Let also $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be the set of cusp-points of M , i.e. the images of critical points of u . Our reduction procedure is local, we make our constructions in a neighbourhood of every point x_j separately. So from now on we fix such a point x . Due to the *Corollaries 2.2.3* and *3.4.2* there exists a neighbourhood U of x which contains no other cusp-points and no other self-intersection points. The *Theorem 3.4.1 i)* implies that taking the neighbourhood U small enough we may assume that any component of $M \cap U$ goes through $p \in U$. Without losing generality we may also assume that U is the unit ball $B \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, that x corresponds to the center 0 of B , and $J(0) = J_{\text{st}}$.

Denote by Γ_j the irreducible components of $M \cap B$ and let $u_j : \Delta \rightarrow B$ be parameterization of Γ_j , such that $u_j(0) = 0 \in B$. Denote $\mu_j := \text{ord}_0 du_j + 1$, so $0 \in \Delta$ is the cusp-point for u_j iff $\mu_j \geq 2$.

Step 1. Rescaling procedure.

Take some cusp-component Γ_j . Due to *Corollary 3.1.3* the map u_j has the form $u_j(z) = z^{\mu_j} \cdot a_j + O(|z|^{\mu_j + \alpha})$ with the constant $a_j \neq 0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$. More over, *Lemma 3.2.3* provides that

$$|du_j(z) - \mu_j z^{\mu_j - 1} a_j \cdot dz| \leq C(\|u_j\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)}, \alpha, p) \cdot |z|^{\mu_j - 1 + \alpha},$$

for any $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $2 < p < \infty$.

For $0 < r \leq 1$ we consider the maps $\pi_r : B \rightarrow B$, $\pi_r(w) := r^{\mu_j} \cdot w$, the rescaled maps $u_j^{(r)} : \Delta \rightarrow B$, $\pi_r \circ u_j^{(r)}(z) = u_j(rz)$, and the rescaled almost complex structures $J^{(r)} := \pi_r^* J$ in B . The map $u_j^{(r)}$ is a parametrization of $J^{(r)}$ -holomorphic curves $\pi_r^{-1} \Gamma_j$. One can see

that $\|u_j^{(r)}(z) - z^{\mu_j} a_j\|_{C^0(\Delta)} \leq C \cdot r^{\mu_j + \alpha}$ and $\|du_j^{(r)}(z) - \mu_j \cdot z^{\mu_j - 1} a_j \cdot dz\|_{C^0(\Delta)} \leq C \cdot r^{\mu_j - 1 + \alpha}$. In particular, there exists $r_j > 0$ such that for all $0 < r < r_j$ the maps $u_j^{(r)}$ are transversal to all spheres S_1^3 . On the other hand, $\|J^{(r)} - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} = O(r^{\mu_j})$, and for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we can choose sufficiently small $r_j > 0$ such that $\|J^{(r)} - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} \leq \varepsilon$ for all $0 < r < r_j$. So replacing B , J and all the maps u_j by their rescaled counterpart we may assume that the almost complex structure J satisfies the estimate

$$\|J - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (4.2.2)$$

Step 2. Reduction to the case of holomorphic cusp-points.

Recall, that in the *Lemma 1.1.1* we establish the natural diffeomorphism between the space $\mathbb{J}$ of orthogonal complex structures in $\mathbb{R}^4$ and the unit sphere $S^2 := \{(c_1, c_2, s) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : c_1^2 + c_2^2 + s^2 = 1\}$. Define the function $\Phi : \mathbb{J} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ by setting $\Phi(J) = (c_1, c_2)$. The map Φ defines a diffeomorphism between the upper half-sphere in S^2 and the unit disk $\mathbb{R}^2$, such that the north pole $(0, 0, 1) \in S^2$ corresponds to the center of the disk.

Define the function $f : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ setting $f(w) := \Phi(J(w))$. Due to (4.2.3), f parameterizes the given almost complex structure J , $\|f\|_{C^1(B)} \leq C\varepsilon$, and $f(0) = 0$. Fix a cut-off function χ in B , such that $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$, $\chi|_{B(1/2)} \equiv 1$, $\text{supp } \chi \Subset B$, and $\|d\chi\|_{C^1(B)} \leq 3$. For $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and $0 < \sigma < 1$ set $f_{\sigma,t}(w) := (1 - t\chi(w/\sigma)) \cdot f(w)$ and define $J_{\sigma,t} := \Phi^{-1}(f_{\sigma,t})$. One can easily see that $\|f_{\sigma,t}\|_{C^1(B)} \leq 4 \cdot \|f\|_{C^1(B)}$, and consequently $\|J_{\sigma,t} - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} \leq C_1 \cdot \|J - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} \leq C_1 \cdot \varepsilon$. Here the constant C_1 , as also the constants $C_2, \dots, C_5$ below in the proof, are independent of ε , t and σ . For fixed σ , the curve $J_{\sigma,t}$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$ is a homotopy between $J \equiv J_{\sigma,0}$ and an almost complex structure $J_\sigma := J_{\sigma,1}$, such that $J_{\sigma,t} \equiv J$ in $B \setminus B(\sigma)$ and $J_\sigma \equiv J_{\text{st}}$ in $B(\frac{\sigma}{2})$. More over, we have

$$\|J_{\sigma,t} - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} + \left\| \frac{dJ_{\sigma,t}}{dt} \right\|_{C^1(B)} \leq C_2 \cdot \varepsilon. \quad (4.2.3)$$

Now we fix some $p > p' > 2$ and set $\alpha := \frac{2}{p'} - \frac{2}{p}$. Due to (4.2.3) we can apply *Lemma 3.3.1 i)* to the map u_j with $\nu_j = \mu_j$, $v_j \equiv 0$, and with the curve of C^1 -smooth almost complex structures $J_{\sigma,t}$. As result we obtain a curve of maps $u_{j,\sigma,t} = u_j + z^{\mu_j} w_{j,\sigma,t}$ with $w_{j,\sigma,t}(0) = 0$ and $\|w_{j,\sigma,t}\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)} \leq C_3 \cdot \|u_j\|_{L^{1,p}(B)}$. The condition $\text{supp } \dot{J}_{\sigma,t} \subset B(\sigma)$ together with *Corollary 3.1.3* provide that $\text{supp } (\dot{J}_{\sigma,t} \circ du_{j,\sigma,t}) \subset \Delta(\rho)$ with $\rho \sim \sigma^{1/\mu_j}$. Due to (3.3.8) and the Hölder inequality we obtain

$$\left\| z^{-\mu_j} \cdot \dot{J}_{\sigma,t}(u_{j,\sigma,t}) \circ du_{j,\sigma,t} \right\|_{L^{p'}(\Delta)} \leq C_4 \cdot \sigma^{\alpha/\mu_j} \cdot \|u_j\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)}^2 \cdot \|\dot{J}_{\sigma,t}\|_{C^1(B)}, \quad (4.2.4)$$

and consequently

$$\|w_{j,\sigma,1}\|_{L^{1,p'}(\Delta)} \leq C_5 \cdot \sigma^{\alpha/\mu_j} \cdot \|u_j\|_{L^{1,p}(\Delta)}^2 \quad (4.2.5)$$

The *Lemma 3.2.3* provides that for σ small enough the J_σ -holomorphic maps $u_{j,\sigma} := u_{j,\sigma,1}$ are transversal to all spheres S_r^3 , $0 < r < \frac{1}{2}$, have no self-intersection points in $B(\frac{1}{2}) \setminus B(\frac{1}{4})$, and the Bennequin index of $u_{j,\sigma}(\Delta) \cap S_r^3$, $\frac{1}{4} < r < \frac{1}{2}$, coincides with the one of $\Gamma_j \cap S_r^3$,

$0 < r < 1$. More over, we may match $u_{j,\sigma}$ to the rest of M , changing in an appropriate way the almost complex structure J , see *Lemma 6.2.1*.

As result we conclude that for appropriate small enough neighbourhoods $U_1 \Subset U$ of any cusp-point $p \in M$ there exist a perturbed almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$ and $\tilde{J}$ -holomorphic curve $\tilde{M}$, which is parameterized by $\tilde{u} : \bigsqcup_{j=1}^d S_j \longrightarrow X$ and has the following properties:

- i) $\tilde{J}$ and $\tilde{M}$ coincide on $X \setminus U$ with J and M correspondingly;
- ii) U_1 is a ball centered in p and $\tilde{M} \cap U_1$ is obtained from $M \cap U_1$ by perturbing of its components in the above described way;
- iii) the (possibly reducible) curve $\tilde{\gamma} := \partial U_1 \cap \tilde{M}$ is isotopic to $\gamma := \partial U_1 \cap M$, in particular all the corresponding components $\tilde{\gamma}_j$ of $\tilde{\gamma}$ and γ_j of γ have the same Bennequin index, and the linking number $l(\tilde{\gamma}_i, \tilde{\gamma}_j)$ equals to $l(\gamma_i, \gamma_j)$;
- iv) $\tilde{u}$ is homotopic to u ;
- v) the cusp-points of $\tilde{M}$ coincide with the ones of M and $\tilde{\delta} + \tilde{\varkappa} = \delta + \varkappa$,
- vi) $\tilde{J}$ is integrable in a neighbourhood.

The last equality of v) follows from iii) du to the *Lemma 4.1.2*. Thus the formulas (4.2.1) for M and $\tilde{M}$ are equivalent.

Step 3. Final reduction to the case of an immersed curve.

This step is rather obvious and uses the following fact, shown in [Bn]. Let B be the unit ball in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and let Γ_0 be an irreducible holomorphic curve in B , which is transversal to ∂B and is defined as zero-divisor of a holomorphic function f . Then for any sufficiently small nonzero $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{C}$ the curve Γ_ε , defined as the zero-divisor of the function $f + \varepsilon$, are smooth and of the same genus g . More over, all Γ_ε are transversal to ∂B and the Bennequin index of $\gamma_\varepsilon := \Gamma_\varepsilon \cap \partial B$ equals to $2g - 1$. In particular, the conductor of a single cusp-point of a holomorphic curve in B can be defined as a genus of general small perturbation to a smooth curve.

In general, let M be a J -holomorphic curve in X , such that J is integrable in a neighbourhood of every cusp-point of M . One can now see that we can perturb J and M to an almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$ and a $\tilde{J}$ -holomorphic curve $\tilde{M}$, satisfying the conditions i)–iv) from above, and the desired condition

$$v') \quad \tilde{M} \text{ has no cusp-points, } \sum \tilde{g}_j = \sum g_j + \varkappa, \quad \tilde{\delta} = \delta.$$

q.e.d.

An important corollary of the proof of *Theorem 3* is the estimate from below of the conductor number of a cusp point.

Corollary 4.2.2. *Let J be an almost complex structure in the unit ball $B \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ with $J(0) = J_{\text{st}}$, and let $u : \Delta \rightarrow B$ be a J -holomorphic curve with the cusp-point $u(0) = 0$. Then $\varkappa_0$ is integer, $\varkappa_0 \geq \text{ord}_0 du$, or equivalently, for all sufficiently small $r > 0$ the Bennequin index of $\gamma_r := u(\Delta) \cap S_r^3$ is odd and satisfies the inequality*

$$b(\gamma_r) \geq 2 \cdot \text{ord}_0 du - 1. \tag{4.2.6}$$

Proof. Rescaling u as in the *Step 1* of the proof of the *Theorem 3* we may assume that $\Gamma := u(\Delta)$ has no nodes and cusps, excepting $0 \in \Delta$, and is transversal to all spheres S_r^3 ,

$0 < r < 1$, so that the Bennequin index $b(\gamma_r)$ is the same and equals to $2\kappa_0 - 1$. We may also assume that for the rescaled almost complex structure J the estimate $\|J - J_{\text{st}}\|_{C^1(B)} \leq \varepsilon$ with the appropriate ε is fulfilled. Applying the *Step 2* with a sufficiently small σ we can deform u into a $\tilde{J}$ holomorphic map $\tilde{u}$, which has the following properties:

- i) $\tilde{\Gamma} := \tilde{u}(\Delta)$ is transversal to all spheres S_r^3 , $0 < r < 1$;
- ii) $\tilde{\Gamma}$ has no self-intersection points in $B \setminus B(\frac{1}{2})$, and the Bennequin index of $\tilde{\gamma}_r := \tilde{\Gamma} \cap S_r^3$, $\frac{1}{2} < r < 1$, coincides with the one of γ_r ;
- iii) $\tilde{J}$ coincides with J in $B \setminus B(\frac{1}{2})$, is integrable in the neighbourhood of $0 \in B$, and $\text{ord}_0 d\tilde{u} = \text{ord}_0 du$.

Now of the corollary follows from *Lemmas 4.1.* and the fact that for *integrable* complex structures the same statement is true, see [Bn].

q.e.d.

Another modification of the proof of *Theorem 3* leads to the following corollary.

Lemma 4.2.3 *Let J be a $C^1(X)$ -almost complex structure on X and $M \subset X$ a compact J holomorphic curve parameterized by $u : S \rightarrow X$. Then*

- i) u can be $L^{2,p}$ -approximate by J_n -holomorphic immersions $u_n : S \rightarrow X$ with $J_n \rightarrow J$ in $C^1(X)$.
- ii) there exists a $C^1(X)$ -approximation J_n of J and a sequence of J_n -holomorphic imbedded curves M_n which converges to M in the Gromov topology.

Proof. We do not need this result for the purpose of this paper, so we give only the sketch of the proof.

On the first step, one applies the rescaling procedures in order to find appropriate small neighbourhoods of the cusp-points of M .

On the second step, one applies the *Lemma 3.1.3* to the chosen neighbourhoods, taking $\nu = 1$, v sufficiently small, and J unchanged. After matching procedure, this gives the statement i).

To obtain the statement ii), one needs firsts to deform all the nodes of M into simple transversal ones, and to find an appropriate small neighbourhood U of every node. In some complex coordinates (w_1, w_2) in U , the curve M is defined by equation $w_1 \cdot w_2 = 0$. It remains to replace a node $M \cap U$ by a “small handle” $M_\varepsilon := \{(w_1, w_2) \in U : w_1 \cdot w_2 = \varepsilon\}$ with ε sufficiently small and to use the matching procedure once more.

q.e.d.

5. Continuity principles and envelopes.

5.1. Continuity principles relative to the Kähler spaces.

Our aim in this paragraph is to prove *Theorem 1* and give some corollaries from it and from other results of this paper. First of all we shall need an appropriate form of so called “continuity principle” for the extension of meromorphic mappings.

We shall work in Gromov topology on the space of stable curves over X , see Appendix 6.3 for definitions. Continuity of the family of curves will be understood allways with respect to this topology. The reason for this refinement of the usual cycle topology is the following Proposition, which will be used in the poof of Continuity principle.

Consider a sequence (C_n, u_n) of stable curves over a complex manifold X , which converges in Gromov topology to (C_0, u_0) . We suppose C_n to be smooth, except C_0 .

Proposition 5.1.1. *There exist a natural N and smooth complex surface $\mathcal{C}$ together with a surjective holomorphic mapping $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \Delta$ and holomorphic mapping $\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow X$ such that the family*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{U}} & X \\ \pi \downarrow & & \\ \Delta & & \end{array}$$

is a holomorphic family of stable curves over X joining (C_N, u_N) with (C_0, u_0) . More precisely:

- 1) *For every $\lambda \in \Delta$ $C_\lambda = \pi^{-1}(\lambda)$ is a connected nodal curve with boundary ∂C_λ and the pair $(C_\lambda, u_\lambda := \mathcal{U}|_{C_\lambda})$ is a stable curve over X .*
- 2) *For λ outside of zero C_λ is connected and smooth.*
- 3) *(C_0, u_0) is our limit and there is $\lambda_N \in \Delta$ such that $(C_{\lambda_N}, u_{\lambda_N}) = (C_N, u_N)$.*
- 4) *There are an open subsets $U_1, \dots, U_m$ of $\mathcal{C}$ such that U_j is biholomorphic to $\Delta \times A_j$, where A_j are an annuli in $\mathbb{C}$. In particular the following diagram is commutative*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_j & \sim & \Delta \times A_j \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_\Delta \\ \Delta & = & \Delta \end{array}$$

The proof will be postponed till Appendix 6.3.

For the notion of meromorphic mapping from a domain U in complex manifold into a complex manifold (or space) Y we refer to [Rm]. We only point out here that meromorphic mappings into $Y = \mathbb{CP}^1$ are exactly meromorphic functions on U , see [Rm].

Definition 5.1.1. *A Hermitian complex space Y is called disk-convex if for any sequence (C_n, u_n) of stable curves over Y such that*

- 1) *area($u_n(C_n)$) are uniformly bounded;*
 - 2) *u_n C^1 -converges in the neighborhoods of ∂C_n ;*
- there is a compact $K \subset Y$ which contain all $u_n(C_n)$.*

This definition obviously transforms to the case when Y is a symplectic manifold. In this case one should consider (C_n, u_n) as J_n -holomorphic curves, with J_n converging to some J (everything in C^1 -tology), and all structures being tamed by a given symplectic form.

Let U is now a domain in complex manifold X and Y is a complex space .

Definition 5.1.2. *An envelope of meromorphy of U relative to Y is a largest domain $(\hat{U}_Y, \pi)$ over X , which contains U (i.e. there exists an imbedding $i : U \rightarrow \hat{U}_Y$ with $\pi \circ i = \text{Id}$), such that every meromorphic map $f : U \rightarrow Y$ extends to a meromorphic map $\hat{f} : \hat{U}_Y \rightarrow Y$.*

Using Cartan-Thullen construction for the germs of meromorphic mappings of open subsets of X into Y instead of germs of holomorphic functions, one can prove the existence and uniqueness of the envelope:

Proposition 5.1.2. *For any domain U in complex space X and for any complex space Y there exists a maximal domain $(\hat{U}_Y, \pi)$ over X , containing U such that every meromorphic mapping $f : U \longrightarrow Y$ extends to a meromorphic mapping $\hat{f} : \hat{U}_Y \longrightarrow Y$. Such domain is unique up to a natural isomorphism.*

See [Iv-1] for details.

Theorem 5.1.3. (Continuity principle-I). *Let X be a disk-convex complex surface and Y a disk-convex Kähler space. Then the envelope of meromorphy $(\hat{U}_Y, \pi)$ of U relative to Y is also disk-convex.*

This result can be reformulated in more usual terms as follows.

Let $\{(C_t, u_t)\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ be a family of complex curves over X with boundaries, parameterized by unit interval. More precisely, for each $t \in [0,1[$ a smooth Riemannian surface with boundary $(C_t, \partial C_t)$ is given together with holomorphic mapping $u_t : C_t \longrightarrow X$, which is C^1 -smooth up to the boundary. Note that C_1 is not supposed to be smooth, i.e. it can be a nodal curve! (see Appendix 6.3).

Suppose that in the neighbourhood V of $u_0(C_0)$ a meromorphic map f into complex space Y is given.

Definition 5.1.3. We shall say that the map f meromorphically extends along the family (C_t, u_t) if for every $t \in [0,1]$ a neighbourhood V_t of $u_t(C_t)$ is given, and given a meromorphic map $f_t : V_t \longrightarrow Y$ such that

- a) $V_0 = V$ and $f_0 = f$;
- b) if $V_{t_1} \cap V_{t_2} \neq \emptyset$ then $f_{t_1}|_{V_{t_1} \cap V_{t_2}} = f_{t_2}|_{V_{t_1} \cap V_{t_2}}$.

Theorem 5.1.4. (Continuity principle-II) *Let U be a domain in complex surface X . Let $\{(C_t, u_t)\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ be a continuous family of complex curves over X with boundaries in U_1 - relatively compact subdomain in U . Suppose moreover that $u_0(C_0) \subset U$ and that C_t for $t \in [0,1[$ are smooth. Then every meromorphic mapping f from U to the disk-convex Kähler space Y extends meromorphically along the family (C_t, u_t) .*

Taking as image manifold Y complex line $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{CP}^1$ we get the continuity principles for holomorphic or meromorphic functions. When it is necessary to underline that we consider the mappings into the certain manifold Y we shall refer to the statement above as to the continuity principle relative to Y or c.p. for the meromorphic mappings into Y .

The discussion made above leads to the following

Corollary 5.1.5. *If we have the domain U in complex surface X , Kähler space Y and family $\{(C_t, u_t)\}$ satisfying the conditions of the "continuity principle", then the family $\{(C_t, u_t)\}$ can be lifted onto the $\hat{U}_Y$, i.e. there exists a continuous family $\{(C_t, \hat{u}_t)\}$ of analytic curves in $\hat{U}$ such that $\pi \circ \hat{u}_t = u_t$ for each t .*

Of course the point here is that the mapping can be extended to the neighborhood of $u_1(C_1)$, which is a reducible curve having in general compact components.

Proof of the Theorem 5.1.3. Suppose that there is a subsequence of our sequence, we still denote it as (C_n, u_n) , which is not contained in any compact subset of the envelope $(\hat{U}_Y, \pi)$. Put $v_n = \pi \circ u_n$ and consider our sequence as a sequence (C_n, v_n) of stable curves over X . While the areas are bounded, we can suppose that this sequence converges in Gromov

topology by the disk-convexity of X . Denote by (C_0, v_0) its limit. For N sufficiently large take a holomorphic family $(\mathcal{C}, \pi, \mathcal{V})$ joining (C_N, v_N) with (C_0, v_0) as in Proposition 5.1.1.

Let $f : \hat{U}_Y \rightarrow Y$ be some meromorphic mapping of our envelope into a disk-convex Kähler space Y . Composing f with $\mathcal{V}$ we get a meromorphic map $h := f \circ \mathcal{V} : \bigcup U_j \cup \pi^{-1}(V(\lambda_N)) \rightarrow Y$. Here $V(\lambda_N)$ is sufficiently small neighborhood of $\lambda_N \in \Delta$.

Denote by W the maximal connected open subset of Δ containing $V(\lambda_N)$ such that h meromorphically extends onto $\bigcup U_j \cup \pi^{-1}(W)$. We want to prove that $W = \Delta$. Denote by Γ_{f_λ} the graph of the restriction $f|_{C_\lambda}$. Fix some Hermitian metric on $\mathcal{C}$.

Lemma 5.1.6. *For any compact $K \subset \Delta$ there is a constant M_K , such that $\text{area}(\Gamma_{f_\lambda}) \leq M_K$ for all $\lambda \in W \cap K$.*

Proof. Shrinking $\mathcal{C}$ if necessary, we can suppose that f has only finite number of points of indeterminacy in $\bigcup_j U_j$. Denote by S_W the discrete subset in W , which consists of points $s \in W$ such that either the fiber C_s is singular or s is the projections of the indeterminacy points of $f|_{\mathcal{C}|_W}$. Fix a point $\lambda_1 \in W \setminus S_W$. Take a path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow W \setminus S_W$ connecting λ_1 with some $\lambda_2 \in W \setminus S_W$. Take some relatively compact in $W \setminus S_W$ neighborhood V of $\gamma([0, 1])$.

Recall that a Kähler metric on complex space Y consists of locally finite covering $\{V_\alpha\}$ of Y and strictly plurisubharmonic functions ϕ_α on V_α , such that $\phi_\alpha - \phi_\beta$ are pluriharmonic on $V_\alpha \cap V_\beta$. $\{f^{-1}(V_\alpha)\}$ is a covering of $\pi^{-1}(V)$ and $dd^c f^* \phi_\alpha = w$ is correctly defined semi-positive closed forme on $\pi^{-1}(V)$. We have that

$$\text{area}(\Gamma_{f_\lambda}) = \text{area}(C_\lambda) + \int_{C_\lambda} w.$$

By the Stokes formula

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{C_{\gamma(0)}} w - \int_{C_{\gamma(1)}} w &= \int_{\bigcup_t C_{\gamma(t)}} dw - \int_{\bigcup_t \partial C_{\gamma(t)}} w = \\ &= \int_{\bigcup_t \partial C_{\gamma(t)}} w. \end{aligned}$$

This is obviously uniformly bounded on $\lambda_2 \in K \setminus S_W$. Which implies the uniform bound in K by Gromov (or Bishop in this case) compactness theorem.

q.e.d.

Lemma 5.1.7. *Mapping h meromorphically extends onto $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. Let us prove first that h meromorphically extends onto $\mathcal{C}$ minus the singular fiber C_0 , i.e. that $W \supset \Delta \setminus \{0\}$.

The same arguments as in [Iv-2] (the only difference is that in [Iv-2] curves C_λ where disks) show that $(\Delta \cap \partial W) \setminus (\{0\})$ is an analytic variety. Now, using Thullen-type extension theorem of Siu, see [Si-1], we can extend h onto $\mathcal{C} \setminus C_0$.

Denote by $\hat{C}_0$ the union of compact components of C_0 . $\hat{C}_0$ contracts to a finite number of normal points. To prove this we can suppose that $\hat{C}_0$ is connected. Otherwise we can apply the same arguments as below to the connected components. We shall prove now that

$\hat{C}_0$ contracts to a normal point. Denote by $E_1, \dots, E_n$ the irreducible components of $\hat{C}_0$. All we must to prove is that the matrix (E_i, E_j) is negatively defined, see [Gra]. Denote by l_i the multiplicity of E_i . Thus $\hat{C}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n l_i \cdot E_i$. Denote by M the $\mathbb{Z}$ -module generated by $E_1, \dots, E_n$ with scalar product - intersection of divisors. Put $D = \hat{C}_0$. Then we have

- 1) $E_i \cdot E_j \geq 0$ for $i \neq j$;
- 2) $D \cdot E_i \leq 0$ for all i , because this number is not more then the intersection of E_i with nonsingular fiber C_λ .

By Proposition 3 from [Sh], v.1, Appendix 1, we have that $A \cdot A \leq 0$ for all $A \in M$ and $A \cdot A = 0$ iff A is proportional to D . But $D \cdot D < \hat{C}_0 \cdot C_\lambda = 0$, where C_λ is a smooth fiber. This proves that (E_i, E_j) is negatively defined.

So all that left to prove, is that normal point is a removable singularity for the meromorphic mappings into a disk-convex Kähler space.

Let $(\mathcal{C}, s)$ is a germ of two-dimensional variety with isolated normal singularity s . Let a meromorphic map $h : \mathcal{C} \setminus \{s\} \rightarrow Y$ is given. Realise $\mathcal{C}$ as a finite proper analytic cover over a bidisk Δ^2 with s being the only point over zero. Denote by $p : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \Delta^2$ this covering.

Composition $h \circ p^{-1}$ is a multivalued meromorphic map from $\Delta^2 \setminus \{0\}$ to Y . This can be extended to origin, see [Si-1]. Consider the following analytic set in $\mathcal{C} \times Y$:

$$\Gamma = \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{C} \times Y : (p(x), y) \in \Gamma_{h \circ p^{-1}}\}.$$

The irreducible component of Γ which contains Γ_h will be the graph of the extension of h onto $\mathcal{C}$.

q.e.d.

Let us turn to the proof of the Theorem. We have a holomorphic family $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \Delta$ of stable curves (C_λ, v_λ) over X such that:

- 1) $(C_{\lambda_0}, v_{\lambda_0}) = (C_0, v_0)$;
- 2) $h = f \circ \mathcal{V}$ extends meromorphically onto $\mathcal{C}$, where $\mathcal{V} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow X$ is an evaluation map.

We want to lift this family into the envelope $(\hat{U}_Y, \pi)$. Denote by $E_1, \dots, E_l$ the set of all irreducible curves in $\mathcal{C}$ which are contracted by $\mathcal{V} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow X$ to the points. $\mathcal{C} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^l E_j$ clearly lifts to the envelope by the Cartan-Thullen construction. Note further that E_j do not intersect $\bigcup_{j=1}^m U_j$. That's why either $E_j \subset \hat{C}_0$ - is a compact component of singular fiber, or projects surjectively on Δ under the projection $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \Delta$. In the second case it intersects C_0 and the point $u(C_0 \cap E_j)$ lifts to the envelope. This proves that $\mathcal{C} \setminus \hat{C}_0$ lifts to the envelope. More precisely, we had shown that $\mathcal{C} \setminus \hat{C}'_0$ lift into the envelope, where $\hat{C}'_0$ is a union of all compact components of the singular fiber mapped by $\mathcal{V}$ into the points.

Denote by $\hat{C}$ some connected subset of $\hat{C}'_0$ and take its neighborhood V , which do not intersect other components of $\hat{C}'_0$. Then $\mathcal{V}$ maps V onto the neighborhood of the point $\mathcal{V}(\hat{C})$ in X . And now is clear that this point lifts to the envelope.

Thus we had proved that (C_0, v_0) lifts to the envelope $(\hat{U}_Y, \pi)$ of U . This implies that (C_n, u_n) should lie in a compact subset of $\hat{U}_Y$. Contradiction.

q.e.d.

Let us give one corollary of the Continuity principle just proved.

Corollary 5.1.8. *Let X is a complex surface with one singular normal point p . Let D be a domain in X , $\partial D \ni p$. Suppose there is a sequence (C_n, u_n) of stable curves over X converging to (C_0, u_0) in Gromov topology and such that*

- a) there is a compact $K \subset D$ with $u_n(\partial C_n) \subset K$ for all n ;*
- b) $p \in u_0(C_0)$.*

Then every meromorphic function from D extends to the neighborhood of p .

To our knowledge this statement is new also for holomorphic functions.

5.2. Construction of the family of curves.

Now we are ready to construct the family of curves needed for the step 2 in the proof of the Theorem 1.

Let $\{J_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ be a family of C^1 -smooth almost complex structures on the 4-manifold X , depending C^1 -continuously on t , such that all J_t are tamed by a fixed symplectic form ω . We lift the structures J_t onto the envelope $(\hat{U}_Y, \pi)$ in such a way that thouse liftings are standart on $\hat{U}_Y \setminus i(U_1)$, where $i : U \rightarrow \hat{U}_Y$ is a canonical imbedding.

Let for $t = 1$ a J_1 -holomorphic sphere is given. We suppose that $c_1(X)[M] - \delta_1 - \varkappa_1 = p \geq 1$. Here δ_1 is the geometric self-intersection of M_1 and $\varkappa_1$ is the sum of conductors of all cusp-points of M_1 . From Theorem 2 we get a family $M_t = f(J_t)$ of J_t -holomorphic curves for t sufficiently close to 1, where $f : V \subset \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}_S \times \mathcal{J}$ is a local section of $\text{pr}_{\mathcal{J}}$ constructed in Theorem 2.

Definition 5.2.1 *We say that the family $\{M_t\}_{t \in (\hat{t}, 1]}$ of (possibly reducible) J_t -holomorphic curves is semi-continuous if there exist a (may be infinite) partition of the interval $(\hat{t}, 1]$ of the form $1 = t_0 > t_1 > \dots > t_n > \dots$ with $t_n \searrow \hat{t}$, natural numbers $1 = N_0 \leq N_1 \leq \dots \leq N_n \leq \dots$, J_t -holomorphic maps $u_t : \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{N_i} S_i^j \rightarrow X$ for $(t_{i+1}, t_i]$ with $M_t := u_t(\bigsqcup_{j=1}^{N_i} S_i^j)$, such that*

- i) $u_t : (t_{i+1}, t_i] \times \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{N_i} S_i^j \rightarrow X$ is a continuous map;*
- ii) $\text{area}(M_t)$ are uniformly bounded from above;*
- iii) $\mathcal{H}\text{-}\lim_{t \searrow t_{i+1}} M_t := \overline{M}_{t_{i+1}} \supset M_{t_{i+1}}$.*

The inclusion $\overline{M}_{t_{i+1}} \supset M_{t_{i+1}}$ means that $M_{t_{i+1}}$ has no other components that those of $\overline{M}_{t_{i+1}}$.

We say that $\{M_t\}$ is a family of spheres if all S_i^j are spheres.

Let T be the infimum of such $\hat{t}$, for which there is a semi-continuous family $\{M_t\}_{t \in (\hat{t}, 1]}$ of spheres, such that for all irreducible components $M_t^1, \dots, M_t^{N_i}$ of M_t , $t \in (t_{i+1}, t_i]$, one has

- a) $c_1(X)[M_t^j] - \delta_t^j - \varkappa_t^j = p_t^j \geq 1$;*
- b) $\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} p_t^j \geq p$.*

We allow existence of multiple components, i.e. that some of M_t^j can coincide.

The set T is obviously open. To prove the closeness of T we note that since all J_t are tamed by the same form ω , the areas of J_t -holomorphic curve are uniformly in t estimated from above and below by $\int_{M_t} \omega$. More over, since $\overline{M}_{t_{i+1}} \supset M_{t_{i+1}}$ we obtain that $\int_{M_{t_i}} \omega \leq \int_{M_{t_{i+1}}} \omega$. In particular, this implies that the sequence $\{N_i\}$ is bounded from above, and hence stabilizes for i big enough. From Gromov's compactness theorem and disk-convexity of the envelope (Theorem 5.1.3) we obtain that for every $j = 1, \dots, N_i$ the

sequence $\{M_i^j\}_{i=1}^\infty$ has a subsequence, still be denoted in the same way, which converges to a $J_{\hat{t}}$ -holomorphic curve $\overline{M}^j \subset \hat{U}_Y$.

To simplify the notations, we drop the upper index j from now on, and write $\overline{M}$ instead $\overline{M}^j$, having in mind that we can do the same constructions for all $j = 1, \dots, N_i$. Note that all irreducible components of $\overline{M}$ are $J_{\hat{t}}$ -holomorphic spheres. We write $\overline{M} = \bigcup_{k=1}^d m_k \cdot M_k$, where M_k are distinct irreducible components of $\overline{M}$ with the multiplicities $m_k \geq 1$. The genus formula for $\overline{M}$ have now (because of multiplicities!) the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \frac{[\overline{M}]^2 - c_1(X)[\overline{M}]}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^d m_k - \sum_{k=1}^d m_k(\delta_k + \varkappa_k) - \sum_{k < l} m_k \cdot m_l [M_k] \cdot [M_l] \\ - \sum_{k=1}^d \frac{m_k(m_k - 1)}{2} [M_k]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2.1)$$

The formula can be obtained by taking the sum of genus formulas for each M_k and then completing the sum $\sum_{k=1}^d m_k [M_k]^2$ to $[\overline{M}]^2$. Here δ_k and $\varkappa_k$ denote self-intersection and conductor numbers of M_k . We have also

$$\varkappa_i^j + \delta_i^j = \frac{[M_i^j]^2 - c_1(X)[M_i^j]}{2} + 1. \quad (5.2.2)$$

Note that $[\overline{M}]^2 = [M_i^j]^2$ and $c_1(X)[\overline{M}] = c_1(X)[M_i^j]$ for i sufficiently big, and that $\sum_{k < l} m_k m_l [M_k] [M_l] \geq \sum_{k=1}^d m_k - 1$ because the system of curves $\bigcup_{k=1}^d M_k$ is connected. From (5.2.1) and (5.2.2) we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^d m_k(\delta_k + \varkappa_k) + \sum_{k=1}^d \frac{m_k(m_k - 1)}{2} [M_k]^2 \leq \delta_i^j + \varkappa_i^j$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^d m_k c_1(X)[M_k] = c_1(X)[M_i^j].$$

Using positivity of (X, ω) , i.e. the property $[M_k]^2 \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^d m_k \left(c_1(X)[M_k] - \delta_k - \varkappa_k \right) \geq c_1(X)[M_i^j] - \delta_i^j - \varkappa_i^j = p_j.$$

Thus we can choose among $M_1, \dots, M_d$ the subset with properties a) and b).

Returning to the old notations, we can “correct” all $\overline{M}^j$, choosing an appropriate subset $M^j \subset \overline{M}^j$. Now applying *Theorem 2* to all M^j , we can extend our family $\{M_t\}$ in a neighbourhood of $\hat{t}$, and hence define it for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Using continuity principle (see *Corollary 5.1.3*) along each continuous piece of our semi-continuous family, we get the next statement, which is more general then *Theorem 1*.

Theorem 5.2.1. *Let M be a ω -positive immersed two-sphere in a positive disk-convex Kähler surface (X, ω) , having only positive self-intersections. Suppose that $c_1(X) \cdot [M] - \delta = p \geq 1$. Then the envelope of meromorphy $(\hat{U}_Y, \pi)$ of any neighbourhood U of M relative to any disk-convex Kähler space Y contains one-dimensional compact analytic set C such that:*

- (1) $\pi(C) = \bigcup_{k=1}^N C_k$ is a union of rational curves.
- (2) $\sum_{k=1}^N (c_1(X) \cdot [C_k] - \delta_k - \kappa_k) \geq p$.

The next rigidity property of symplectic imbeddings is a straitforward corollary from this theorem.

Corollary 5.2.2. *Let M_1 and M_2 two symplectically imbedded spheres in $\mathbb{CP}^2$. Then any biholomorphism of the neighbourhood of M_1 onto the neighbourhood of M_2 is fractional linear.*

5.3. Examples.

Here we discuss a few more examples concerning the envelopes of meromorphy.

Example 1. Let $(X, \omega) = (\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1, \omega_{FS} \oplus \omega_{FS})$ where ω_{FS} denote the Fubini-Study metric on $\mathbb{CP}^1$. Note that $c_1(X) = 2[\omega]$. Let J be an ω -tame almost complex structure on X and C be a J -holomorphic curve on X . Denote by e_1 and e_2 the standard generators of $H_2(X, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^2$ and write $[C] = a \cdot e_1 + b \cdot e_2$. Then we get $a + b = \int_C \omega \geq 1$ and $c_1(X)[C] = 2(a + b)$. Further, by Genus formula $0 \leq g(C) + \delta + \kappa = (2ab - 2(a + b))/2 + 1 = (a - 1)(b - 1)$. Thus we conclude that both a and b are nonnegative and $[C]^2 = 2ab \geq 0$. So $\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1$ is nonnegative in our sense.

Let M be imbedded symplectic sphere in X . Then $(a - 1)(b - 1) = 0$ by Genus formula. So we can assume that $a = 1$ and $b \geq 0$. Now one concludes that the following holds:

Corollary 5.3.1. *Let M be a symplectic sphere in $(\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \mathbb{CP}^1, \omega_{FS} \oplus \omega_{FS})$. Then the envelope of meromorphy of any neighbourhood of M contains a graph of a rational map of degree $0 \leq d \leq b$ from $\mathbb{CP}^1$ to $\mathbb{CP}^1$.*

Example 2. $(X, \omega) = (\mathbb{CP}^2, \omega_{FS})$. Let M be a symplectic surface in X of degree $m := \int_M \omega$ with positive self-intersections. Then obviously $c_1(X)[M] = 3m$. Remark, that we proceed the construction of a family $\{M_t\}$ if the condition $c_1(X)[M_t^j] > \kappa(M_t^j)$ is satisfied for all irreducible components M_t^j of M_t . By the Genus formula one has $\kappa(C) \leq (d - 1)(d - 2)/2$ for every pseudo-holomorphic curve C of degree d . So we can proceed if $3m > (m - 1)(m - 2)/2$, which is equivalent to $1 \leq m \leq 8$. Thus we have the following

Corollary 5.3.2. *Let M be a symplectic surface in $\mathbb{CP}^2$ of degree $m \leq 8$ with positive self-intersections. Then the envelope of meromorphy of any neighbourhood of M coincide with $\mathbb{CP}^2$ itself.*

Remark. Note that the examples includes all imbedded symplectic surfaces in $\mathbb{CP}^2$ of genus $g \leq 21$.

Example 3. Let X is a ball in $\mathbb{C}^2$, w is a standart euclidean form. Blow up the origin in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and denote by E the exeptional curve. By $\hat{X}$ denote the blown-up ball X . Blown-up $\mathbb{C}^2$ is also Kähler, denote by w_0 some Kähler form there. Consider a sufficiently small C^1 -perturbation of E . This will be a w_0 -symplectic sphere in $\hat{X}$, denote it by M . Chern class of the normal bundle to M is equal to that of for E and thus is -1 . So $c_1(\hat{X})[M] = 1$ and our Theorem 1 applies. E is the only rational curve in $\hat{X}$, so we get that

the envelope of meromorphy of any neighborhood of M contains E .

One can then blow down the picture to obtain downstears a sphere M_1 -image of M under the blown-down map. This M_1 is homologous to zero, so cannot be symplectic, and for this M_1 our Theorem 1 cannot be applied.

6. Appendix.

6.1. A complex structure lemma.

For the convenience of a reader we give here the following (well known for the smooth case) lemma, which the line bundles case can be found in [Hf-L-Sk].

Lemma 6.1.1. *Let S be a Riemannian surface with a complex structure J_S and E a $L^{1,p}$ -smooth complex vector bundle of rank r over S . Let also*

$$\bar{\partial}_E : L^{1,p}(S, E) \rightarrow L^p(S, \Lambda^{(0,1)} S \otimes E)$$

be a differential operator, satisfying the condition

$$\bar{\partial}_E(f\xi) = \bar{\partial}_S f \otimes \xi + f \cdot \bar{\partial}_E \xi, \quad (6.1.1)$$

where $\bar{\partial}_S$ is the Cauchy-Riemann operator, associated to J_S . Then the sheaf

$$U \subset S \mapsto \mathcal{O}(E)(U) := \{\xi \in L^{1,p}(U, E) : \bar{\partial}_E \xi = 0\} \quad (6.1.2)$$

is analytic and locally free of rank r . This defines the holomorphic structure on E , for which $\bar{\partial}_E$ is an associated Cauchy-Riemann operator.

Remark. The condition (6.1.1) means that $\bar{\partial}_E$ of order 1 and has the Cauchy-Riemann symbol.

Proof. It is easy to see that the problem is essentially local. So we may assume that S is a unit disk Δ with the standard complex structure. Let $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$ be a $L^{1,p}$ -frame of E over Δ . Let also $\Gamma \in L^p(\Delta, \Lambda^{0,1} \Delta \otimes \mathbf{Mat}(r, \mathbb{C}))$ be defined by relation

$$\bar{\partial}_E \xi_i = \sum_j \Gamma_j^i \xi_j, \quad \text{or in matrix form,} \quad \bar{\partial}_E \xi = \xi \cdot \Gamma. \quad (6.1.3)$$

Then for any section $\eta = \sum g^i \xi_i$ the equation $\bar{\partial}_E \eta = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\bar{\partial} g^i + \sum_j \Gamma_j^i g^j = 0, \quad \text{or in matrix form,} \quad \bar{\partial} g + \Gamma \cdot g = 0. \quad (6.1.4)$$

In particular, a frame $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_r)$ with $\eta_i = \sum_j g_i^j \xi_j$ consists of sections of $\mathcal{O}(E)$ iff

$$\bar{\partial} g_k^i + \sum_j \Gamma_j^i g_k^j = 0, \quad \text{or in matrix form,} \quad \bar{\partial} g + \Gamma \cdot g = 0. \quad (6.1.5)$$

Let the map $\tau_t : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$ be defined by formula $\tau_t(z) = t \cdot z$, $0 < t < 1$. One can easily check that

$$\|\tau_t^* \Gamma\|_{L^p(\Delta)} \leq t^{1-2/p} \|\Gamma\|_{L^p(\Delta)}.$$

So taking pull-backs $\tau_t^* E$ with t sufficiently small we may assume that $\|\Gamma\|_{L^p(\Delta)}$ is small enough. Now consider the mapping F from $L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbf{Gl}(r, \mathbb{C})) \subset L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbf{Mat}(r, \mathbb{C}))$ to $L^p(\Delta, \Lambda^{0,1} \Delta \otimes \mathbf{Mat}(r, \mathbb{C}))$ defined by formula $F(g) := \bar{\partial} g \cdot g^{-1}$. It is easy to see that the derivation of F in $g \equiv \text{Id}$ equals to $\bar{\partial}$. Due to the Lemma 3.2.1 and the implicit function theorem for any Γ with $\|\Gamma\|_{L^p(\Delta)}$ small enough there exists g in $L^{1,p}(\Delta, \mathbf{Gl}(r, \mathbb{C}))$ with $g(0) = \text{Id}$, satisfying the equality $F(g) = -\Gamma$, which is equivalent to (6.1.5). Consequently, in the neighbourhood of every point $p \in S$ there exists a frame $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$ of E consisting of section of $\mathcal{O}(E)$. Further, due to (6.1.2) a local section $\eta = \sum g^i \xi_i$ of E is a section of $\mathcal{O}(E)$ iff g^i are holomorphic. This implies that $\mathcal{O}(E)$ is analytic and locally free of rank r .

q.e.d.

6.2. A matching structures lemma.

Let $B(r)$ be a ball of radius r in $\mathbb{R}^4$ centered at zero, and J a C^1 -smooth almost-complex structure on $B(2)$, $J(0) = J_{\text{st}}$. Further, let $M = u(\Delta)$ be a closed primitive J -holomorphic disk in $B(2)$ such, that $u(0) = 0$ and M transversally meets S_r^3 for $r \geq 1/2$. Here $S_r^3 = \partial B(r)$ and transversality is understood with respect to both TS_r^3 and F_r , see paragraph 4.1.

By $B(r_1, r_2)$ we shall denote the spherical shell $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : r_1 < \|x\| < r_2\}$. In the lemma below denote by D_δ the preimage of $B(1+\delta)$ by u .

Lemma 6.2.1. *For any positive $\delta > 0$ there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that if an almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$ in $B(1+\delta)$ and a closed $\tilde{J}$ -holomorphic curve $\tilde{u} : D_\delta \rightarrow B(1+\delta)$ satisfy $\|\tilde{J} - J\|_{C^1(\bar{B}(1+\delta))} < \varepsilon$ and $\|\tilde{u} - u\|_{L^{1,p}(\bar{D}_\delta)} < \varepsilon$, then there exists an almost-complex structure J_1 in $B(2)$ and J_1 -holomorphic disk M_1 in $B(2)$ such that:*

- a) $J_1|_{B(1-\delta)} = \tilde{J}|_{B(1-\delta)}$ and $J_1|_{B(1+\delta, 2)} = J|_{B(1+\delta, 2)}$.
- b) $M_1|_{B(1-\delta)} = \tilde{u}(D_\delta) \cap B(1-\delta)$ and $M_1 \cap B(1+\delta, 2) = M \cap B(1+\delta, 2)$.

Proof. We have chosen the parametrization of M to be primitive. So u is an imbedding on $D_{-\delta, \delta} = u^{-1}(B_{1-\delta, 1+\delta})$. Let us identify a neighbourhood V of $u(D_{-\delta, \delta})$ in $B_{1-\delta, 1+\delta}$ with the neighbourhood of zero-section in the normal bundle N to $u(D_{-\delta, \delta})$. Now the $\tilde{u}|_{D_{-\delta, \delta}}$ can be viewed as a section of N over $u(D_{-\delta, \delta})$ which is small i.e. contained in V . Using appropriate smooth function ϕ on $D_{-\delta, \delta}$ (or equivalently on $u(D_{-\delta, \delta})$), $\phi|_{B(1-\delta) \cap D_\delta} \equiv 1$, $\phi|_{\partial D_\delta} \equiv 0$, $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ we can glue $\tilde{u}$ and u to get symplectic surface M_1 which satisfies (b).

Patching J and $\tilde{J}$ and making simultaneously M_1 pseudo-holomorphic can be done in the way we did in the proof of Lemma 1.1.2.

q.e.d.

6.3. Gromov topology and versal deformations of noncompact curves.

We start with giving several definitions and notations needed. Let $\Delta^2 := \{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z_1| < 1, |z_2| < 1\}$ be a bidisk. For $\lambda \in \Delta$ we set $\mathcal{A}_\lambda := \{(z_1, z_2) \in \Delta^2 : z_1 \cdot z_2 = \lambda\}$. $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a union of two disks which we denote by $\mathcal{A}_0^1$ and $\mathcal{A}_0^2$ respectively; the function z_i is a holomorphic coordinate on $\mathcal{A}_0^i$; the only common point of $\mathcal{A}_0^i$ is zero. For $\lambda \neq 0$ $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ is an annulus with a boundary consisting of a pair of circles γ_1 and γ_2 , equipped with a pair of holomorphic coordinates z_1 and z_2 , such that $|z_i|$ restricted to γ_i is identically 1.

If $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, these annuli degenerate into a node, and every function z_i becomes a coordinate on the corresponding irreducible component of $\mathcal{A}_0$. The family $\mathcal{A} := \sqcup_{\lambda \in \Delta} \mathcal{A}_\lambda$ is a holomorphic deformation of $\mathcal{A}_0$. Denote $\mathcal{A}^* := \sqcup_{\lambda \in \Delta^*} \mathcal{A}_\lambda$.

We call $\mathcal{A}_0$ the *standard node*, and the point $(0,0) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ the *nodal point*. It is the only singular point of $\mathcal{A}_0$, which is an ordinary double point.

Definition 6.3.1. *A nodal curve is a connected purely 1-dimensional complex analytic space C , possibly with boundary, satisfying the following conditions:*

- i) *the only singularities of C are finitely many nodal points;*
- ii) *the boundary ∂C consists of finitely many smooth circles $\gamma_i \cong S^1 = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$;*
- iii) *the set $\overline{C} := C \cup \partial C$ is compact.*

In particular, C is smooth in the neighbourhood of ∂C . Note that C can consist of several irreducible components. Nodal curves appear in a natural way as a limit of immersed smooth curves with respect to the Gromov topology, which we describe below. Informally speaking, every node in the limit arises as a result of degeneration of certain annuli on prelimit curves. Topologically, it corresponds to contraction of certain circles on prelimit curves to a nodal point on the limit curve. This explains the next

Definition 6.3.2. *We shall say that connected, oriented real surface with boundary $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma)$ parametrizes a complex nodal curve C if there is a continuous map $\sigma : \Sigma \rightarrow C$ such that:*

- 1) *if $a \in C$ is a nodal point then $\gamma_a = \sigma^{-1}(a)$ is a smooth imbedded circle in $\Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$, and if $a \neq b$, then $\gamma_a \cap \gamma_b = \emptyset$;*
- 2) *$\sigma : \Sigma \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N \gamma_{a_i} \rightarrow C \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_N\}$ is a diffeomorphism. Here $a_1, \dots, a_N$ are nodes of C .*

Roughly speaking, Σ is obtained from C by replacing all nodes of C by corresponding cylinders, the procedure inverse to contracting circles into nodal points. Note that Σ is defined by C uniquely up to diffeomorphism, but σ is not determined by C . However, two parametrisations $\sigma : \Sigma \rightarrow C$ and $\sigma' : \Sigma' \rightarrow C$ differ by a diffeomorphism $f : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma'$. Denote by $\tau : \hat{C} \rightarrow C$ a normalisation of C .

Definition 6.3.3. *A stable curve over an almost complex manifold (X, J) is a pair (C, u) , where C is a connected nodal curve, possibly with boundary $\partial C = \bigcup_{i=1}^d \gamma_i$, and $u : C \rightarrow X$ is a holomorphic map which satisfies the following condition:*

- 1) *if C_j is an irreducible component of C biholomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^1$ and $u(C_j) = \{\text{point}\}$, then $\tau^{-1}(C_j)$ contains at least three points, which are the preimages of the nodes of C ;*
- 2) *if C_j is a torus and again $u(C_j) = \{\text{point}\}$ then $\tau^{-1}(C_j)$ contains at least one preimage of the node of C .*

Now we are going to describe the Gromov topology on the space of stable curves over X . Let a sequence J_n of C^1 -smooth almost complex structures on X is given, and suppose that $J_n \rightarrow J$ in C^1 -topology. Further, let a sequence (C_n, u_n) of stable curves over (X, J_n) is given, such that all C_n are parametrized by the same real surface Σ .

Definition 6.3.4. *We say that (C_n, u_n) converge to a stable curve (C_∞, u_∞) in Gromov topology, if all C_n and C_∞ are parametrised by the same real surface Σ and there exist parametrisations $\sigma_n : \Sigma \rightarrow C_n$ and $\sigma_\infty : \Sigma \rightarrow C_\infty$ such that*

- i) $u_n \circ \sigma_n$ converges to $u_\infty \circ \sigma_\infty$ in $C^0(\overline{\Sigma}, X)$ -topology;
- ii) if $\{a_i\}$ is the set of nodes of C_∞ and $\gamma_i := g_\infty^{-1}(a_i)$ are the corresponding circles in Σ , then on any compact $K \Subset \Sigma \setminus \bigcup_i \gamma_i$ the convergence $u_n \circ \sigma_n \rightarrow u_\infty \circ \sigma_\infty$ is in fact smooth;
- iii) on any compact $K \Subset \Sigma \setminus \bigcup_i \gamma_i$ the complex structures $\sigma_n^* J_n$ converge to the complex structure $\sigma_\infty^* J_\infty$.

The following result is a Gromov compactness theorem, see [Gro].

Theorem. *Suppose that a sequence (C_n, u_n) of stable over X J_n -holomorphic curves is given such that:*

- a) J_n are of class C^1 and are C^1 -converging to J ;
- b) $\text{area}[u_n(C_n)] \leq M$ for all n ;
- c) u_n converge near the boundary, i.e. for any boundary component γ of Σ and any n there is a holomorphic imbedding $\phi : A_r := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : r < |z| < 1\} \rightarrow C_n$ with $\sigma_n^{-1} \circ \phi_n(\{|z| = 1\}) = \gamma$, r not depending on n , such that $u_n \phi_n$ converges on A_r to some J -holomorphic map h_∞ .

Then there is a subsequence (C_{n_k}, u_{n_k}) which converges to a stable over X J -holomorphic curve (C_∞, u_∞) . Moreover for each boundary component γ there is an imbedding $\phi_\infty : A_r \rightarrow C_\infty$ such that $u_n \circ \phi_n \rightarrow u_\infty \circ \phi_\infty = h_\infty$ on A_r .

Our aim is obtain a nice description of the neighborhood in Gromov topology of a stable curve over a complex manifold. This description will allow us to draw analytic families through two sufficiently close curves (Proposition 5.1.1). This will be possible, due to the Theorem of J.-P. Ramis, if one can prove that the moduli space of stable curves over a complex manifold forms a Banach analytic space of finite codimension.

Let B is an open set in some complex Banach space .

Definition 6.3.5. *We say that a closed subset $\mathcal{M} \subset B$ is a banach analytic set of finite codimension if there is an analytic map $F : B \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^N$, for some N , such that $\mathcal{M} = \{x \in B : F(x) = 0\}$.*

In general nothing good can be said about Banach analytic sets. Every compact, ex. interval $[0, 1]$, or a converging sequence of points, can be realised as a Banach analytic set in appropriate Banach space, see [Ra] p. 33. However, the structure of Banach analytic sets of finite codimension is pretty nice according to the following theorem, which is due to Ramis.

Theorem. *Let $\mathcal{M} \subset B$ be a Banach analytic set of finite codimension, $0 \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there is a neighborhood $U \ni x_0$ such that $\mathcal{M} \cap U$ is a finite union of irreducible components $\mathcal{M}_j$, each of them being a finite ramified cover of a neighborhood of zero in the subspace L_j of finite codimension.*

Fix now a complex manifold X and a stable curve (C_0, u_0) over X parametrised by Σ . Our aim in this section is the following

Theorem 6.3.1. *There exist a Banach analytic spaces of finite codimension $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ and holomorphic maps*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{u} & X \\ \pi \downarrow & & \\ \mathcal{M} & & \end{array}$$

such that:

- a) for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}$ fiber $C_\lambda = \pi^{-1}(\lambda)$ is a nodal curve parametrised by Σ and for some λ_0 $C_{\lambda_0} \sim C_0$;
- b) $(C_\lambda, u_\lambda = \mathcal{U}|_{C_\lambda})$ is stable over X and $u_{\lambda_0} = u_0$;
- c) if (C', u') is sufficiently close to (C, f) in Gromov topology then there exists $\lambda' \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $(C', u') = (C_{\lambda'}, F|_{\lambda'})$.

Proof. Let (C_0, u_0) is our stable curve over X . Denote by E the pull-back u_0^*TX of the tangent bundle to X together with natural holomorphic structure on it. We suppose that u_0 extends smoothly onto the boundary of C_0 to be able to consider the $L^{1,p}$ -sections of E .

Cover C_0 by a finite family of open sets U_i with boundaries in such a way that intersections $U_{ij} := U_i \cap U_j$ have piecewisely smooth boundaries. In the case when U_i contains a nodal point it should be a union of two disks. We take U_i sufficiently small to find a coordinate chart V_i containing $u_0(U_i)$.

If U_i is smooth consider a complex Banach manifold of holomorphic mappings $u_i \in L^{1,p}(U_i, V_i)$ with a tangent space at $u_i^0 = u_0|_{U_i}$ equal to $\mathcal{H}^{1,p}(U_i, E)$ -space of holomorphic $L^{1,p}$ -sections of E over U_i .

If U_i is a neighborhood of a node, we consider a complex Banach manifold of holomorphic $L^{1,p}$ -maps from $\mathcal{A}$ to V_i with tangent space at u_i equal to $\mathcal{H}^{1,p}(U_i, E)$, the space of pairs of holomorphic $L^{1,p}$ -sections over the components of a standart node, which coincide at the origin.

Denote by B_i open neighborhoods of u_i in these Banach manifolds. Repeat the same construction for $U_{ij}, i < j$, using as a coordinate chart V_i , and get the Banach manifolds $L^{1,p}(U_{ij}, V_i)$ with tangent spaces $L^{1,p}(U_{ij}, E)$.

Denote by $\phi_{ij} : V_j \rightarrow V_i$ the coordinate change. We can consider the following analytic map between complex Banach manifolds

$$\Phi : \Pi_i B_i \rightarrow \Pi_{i < j} L^{1,p}(U_{i,j}, V_i),$$

$$(\Phi(\{h_i\}))_{ij} := \phi_{ij}(h_j) - h_i.$$

Zero level set of this mapping is a Banach analytic set and is by construction some neighborhood in Gromov topology of (C_0, u_0) in the space of stable complex curves over X . Denote this neighborhood by $\mathcal{M}$. Differential $d\Phi_{u_0}$ of this mapping at u_0 coincides with the differential of Čech complex

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \delta : \sum_{i=1}^l \mathcal{H}^{1,p}(U_i, E) & \longrightarrow & \sum_{i < j} \mathcal{H}^{1,p}(U_{ij}, E) \\ \delta : (v_i)_{i=1}^l & \longmapsto & (v_i - v_j) \end{array}$$

We shall make use now from the following lemma, which states the possibility of solving a Cousin-type problem with estimates.

Lemma 6.3.2. *Let C be a nodal curve with piecewisely smooth boundary and E a holomorphic vector bundle over C . Let $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^l$ be a finite covering of C by Stein domains with piecewisely smooth boundaries. Let $2 \leq p < \infty$ and let $\mathcal{H}^{1,p}(U_i, E)$ denote the space of sections of E , which are holomorphic in U_i and $L^{1,p}$ -smooth till boundary ∂U_i . Set $U_{ij} := U_i \cap U_j$ and suppose that any triple intersection $U_i \cap U_j \cap U_k$ with $i \neq j \neq k \neq i$ is empty.*

Then the Čech complex

$$\begin{aligned} \delta : \quad \sum_{i=1}^l \mathcal{H}^{1,p}(U_i, E) &\longrightarrow \sum_{i < j} \mathcal{H}^{1,p}(U_{ij}, E) \\ \delta : \quad (v_i)_{i=1}^l &\longmapsto (v_i - v_j) \end{aligned} \tag{6.3.1}$$

has the following properties:

- i) *the image $\text{Im}(\delta)$ is of finite codimension and closed; more over, $\text{Coker}(\delta) = H^1(C, E) = H^1(C_{\text{comp}}, E)$, where C_{comp} denotes the union of compact irreducible components of C ;*
- ii) *the kernel $\text{Ker}(\delta)$ admits a closed complementing.*

Proof is left to the reader.

We can finish now the proof of *Theorem 6.3.1*. Denote by $T = \text{Im } d\Phi_{u_0}$ and by S its finite dimensional complement. Let π_T be a projection onto T parallel to S . Implicit function theorem applied to $\pi_T \circ \Phi$ tells us that $\mathcal{M}$ is contained in complex Banach manifold $\mathcal{N}$ with tangent space at u_0 equal to $\text{Ker } d\Phi = \text{Ker } \delta = \mathcal{H}^{1,p}(C_0, E)$. Now our $\mathcal{M}$ is a Banach analytic subset of $\mathcal{N}$ defined by the equation $\pi_S \circ \Phi = 0$, where π_S is a projection onto finite dimensional vector space S parallel to T . Thus $\mathcal{M}$ is of finite codimension.

q.e.d.

Proof of Proposition 5.1.1. Let a sequence of stable curves over X converges to (C_0, u_0) . Take a neighborhood $\mathcal{M}$ of (C_0, u_0) in Gromov topology, which is realised as a Banach analytic set of finite codimension in Banach ball $\mathbf{B}$. Denote by λ_0 the point on $\mathcal{M}$ which corresponds to (C_0, u_0) . By the theorem of Ramis $\mathcal{M}$ in the neighborhood of λ_0 has finite number of irreducible components. One of them, denote it as $\mathcal{M}_1$ should contain a point λ_N which corresponds to (C_N, u_N) . Further, there is a subspace L of $\mathbf{B}$ of finite codimension such that $\mathcal{M}_1$ is a finite covering of $L \cap \mathbf{B}$. Now one can easily find an analytic disk passing through λ_0 and λ_N .

q.e.d.

References.

- [Ar] ARONSAJN, N.: A unique continuation theorem for elliptic differential equation or inequalities of the second order. J. Math. Pures Appl., **36**, 235–339, (1957).

- [B-K] BEDFORD, E., KLINGENBERG W.: *On the envelope of meromorphy of a 2-sphere in $\mathbb{C}^2$* . J. Amer. Math. Soc., **4**, 623-646, (1981).
- [B-P-V] BARTH W., PETERS, C., VAN DE VEN, A.: *Compact complex surfaces*. Springer Verlag, (1984).
- [Bn] BENNEQUIN, D.: *Entrelacement et équation de Pfaff*. Astérisque **107–108**, 87–161 (1982).
- [Cn-Sp] CHERN, S.-S., SPANIER, E.: *A theorem on orientable surfaces in four-dimensional space*. Comment. Math. Helv. **25**, 205–209 (1951).
- [Ch-St] CHIRKA, E., STOUT L.: *A Kontinuitätssatz*. Preprint.
- [E] ELIASBERG, Y.: *Filling by holomorphic discs and its applications*. London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes, **151**, Geometry of low dimensional manifolds, (1991).
- [Gra] GRAUERT, H.: *Über Modifikationen und exzeptionelle analytische Mengen*. Math. Ann. **146**, 331–368 (1962).
- [Gr-Hr] GRIFFITHS, P., HARRIS, J.: *Principle of algebraic geometry*. John Wiley & Sons, N.-Y., (1978).
- [Gro] GROMOV, M.: *Pseudo holomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds*. Invent. math. **82**, 307–347 (1985).
- [Hv-Po] HARVEY, R., POLKING, J.: *Removable singularities of solutions of partial differential equations*. Acta Math. **125**, 209–226 (1970).
- [Hr-W] HARTMAN, P., WINTER, A.: *On the local behavior of solutions of non-parabolic partial differential equations*. Amer. J. Math., **75**, 449–476, (1953).
- [Hf] HOFER, H.: *Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectizations with applications to the Weinstein conjecture in dimension three*. Invent. Math. **114**, 515–563 (1993).
- [Hf-L-Sk] HOFER, H., LIZAN, V., SIKORAV, J.-C.: *On genericity for holomorphic curves in 4-dimensional almost-complex manifolds*. Preprint, (1994).
- [Iv-1] IVASHKOVICH, S.: *Extension of analytic objects by the method of Cartan-Thullen*. In Proceedings of Conference on Complex Analysis and Math. Phys., 53–61, Krasnojarsk, (1988).
- [Iv-2] IVASHKOVICH, S.: *The Hartogs-type extension theorem for meromorphic maps into compact Kähler manifolds*. Invent. Math. **109**, 47–54 (1992).
- [Ko-No] KOBAYASHI, S., NOMIZU, K.: *Foundations of differential geometry*. Vol.II, Interscience Publishers, (1969).
- [Li] LICHNEROVICZ, A: *Global theory of connections and holonomy groups*. Noordhoff Int. Publishing, Leiden, (1976).

- [Mi-Wh] MICALLEF, M., WHITE, B.: *The structure of branch points in minimal surfaces and in pseudoholomorphic curves*. Preprint, (1994).
- [McD-1] MCDUFF, D.: *The local behavior of holomorphic curves in almost complex 4-manifolds*. J.Diff.Geom. **34**, 143-164 (1991).
- [McD-2] MCDUFF, D.: *Singularities of J-holomorphic curves in almost complex 4-manifolds*. J. Geom. Anal. **2**, 249-265 (1992).
- [McD-3] MCDUFF, D.: *Singularities and positivity of intersections of J-holomorphic curves*. In “*Holomorphic curves in symplectic geometry*.” Ed. by M. Audin and J. Lafontaine, Birkhäuser, (1994).
- [Mo] MORREY, C.: *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations*. Springer Verlag, (1966).
- [Ra] RAMIS J.-P.: *Sous-ensembles analytiques d’une variété banachique complexe*. Springer, Berlin (1970).
- [Rf] ROLFSEN, D.: *Knots and links*. Publish or perish. **N7** (1976).
- [Sk] SIKORAV, J.-C.: *Some properties of holomorphic curves in almost complex manifolds*. In “*Holomorphic curves in symplectic geometry*.” Ed. by M. Audin and J. Lafontaine, Birkhäuser, (1994).
- [Si-1] SIU, Y.-T.: *Extension of meromorphic maps into Kähler manifolds*. Annals of Math. **102**, 421-462 (1975).
- [Si-2] SIU, Y.-T.: *Every Stein subvariety admits a Stein neighbourhood*. Invent.math. **38**, 89-100 (1976).
- [Sh] SHAFAREVICH I.: *Basic algebraic geometry. Second edition*. Springer-Verlag.
- [Rm] REMMERT, R.: *Holomorphe und meromorphe Abbildungen komplexer Räume*. Math. Ann. **133**, 328-370 (1957).
- [Sh] SHCHERBINA, N.: *On the polynomial hull of a two-dimensional sphere in $\mathbb{C}^2$* . Soviet Math. Doklady, **49**, 629-632, (1991).
- [Wn] WEINSTEIN, A.: *Lectures on symplectic manifolds*. CBMS. Reg. Conf. Series, **N29**, AMS(1977).
- [Wa] WALKER, R.: *Algebraic curves*. Springer Verlag, (1978).

Institute of Appl. Prob. Mech. & Math.
 Ukrainian Acad. Sci.,
 vul. Naukova 3b, 290053 L’viv
 Ukraine

U.F.R. de Mahtématiques
 Université de Lille-I
 Villeneuve d’Ascq Cedex
 59655 France
 ivachkov@gat.univ-lille1.fr

Institute of Appl. Prob. Mech. & Math.
 Ukrainian Acad. Sci.,
 vul. Naukova 3b, 290053 L’viv
 Ukraine

Ruhr-Universität Bochum
 Mathematisches Institut
 Universitätsstrasse 150
 NA 4/67 44780 Bochum Germany
 sewa@cplx.ruhr-uni-bochum.de